Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

for a population of 179,323,175 for a House of the same 435 seats.

Although the House of Representatives was consistently increased in the number of seats as the population increased and new States were admitted into the Union, now, with a smashing increase in population and two additional new States, the effect of allowing the House to remain at 435 seats is tantamount to a reduction in the size of the House, contrary to precedent and contrary to the very increases, in fact, to 436 seats when Alaska was admitted to the Union, and a further increase to 437 seats when Hawaii was admitted, and contrary to the fact that the House as now constituted has 437 seats.

If Hawaii is to be allotted 2 seats and Alaska 1 seat and the House still be limited to 435 seats, it follows that the House eliminated 3 seats of its then membership when it voted for the admission of those 2 States into the Union. That was never intended and such an unintentional effect should not now be given. It was never presented to the House, in terms, that the House should reduce its size and it was not contemplated that any existing seats will be sacrificed to the new States, welcome as they are. In deed and in fact, the Senate was not reduced in size when new States were added, to the contrary, it was increased in size from 92 seats in 1910 to 100 seats in 1960. Unless corrective measures are taken it will be the indoor sport of statisticians and theoreticians to speculate over whose seats were displaced by the new admittees, and, was it worth it.

Since the size of the House was set at 435 seats in 1910 this country has seen our population virtually doubled from what it was then; our legislation multiplied multifold; our blood poured on distant battlefields in World War I, World War II, and Korea. Our Nation emerged as a world power and world leader: a League of Nations, a United Nations, at NATO, a SEATO. Never had the people of the United States, as individuals, been so intimately concerned with the affairs of Government; never has the Government been so intimately concerned with the affairs of the individual, as since 1910; since income tax was adopted; since social security legislation was adopted; since controls over greed and avarice were adopted so that no American shall again go hungry, or mulcted out of his savings, or deprived of a fair return for his labor, his farm, his risks, and be prey to foreign ideologies which breed on the heartaches and resentments of distress, dismay, and disaffection.

At no time prior to 1910 was there a recession comparable to the depression of 1929. No achievements prior to 1910, in the area of nuclear science, or the supersonic speeds in the world of aerodynamics, or space flights in the art of communication, navigation, and astronomy, compare in immediate impact on the Nation and its safety.

In all this, and with all this, a House of 435 seats may be considered as having acted well and wisely, that is subject to debate, but it is for us to remember that it is not the Senate, it is the House that is closest to the rank and file of the American public, yet the Senate was increased and the House was not.

It was never intended that the House of Representatives, of all bodies, be removed from the people. The only occasion on which George Washington, President of the Constitutional Convention, entered into the discussions of the Convention was when he urged that the House be made accessible to more people rather than less. James Madison reported in his Journal of the Federal Convention that when it was proposed that the constitutional requirement of 1 Representative for every 40,000 be amended to 1 for every 30,000, George Washington spoke out on the proposed amendment and urged its adoption and asserted that it would give him much satisfaction to see the smaller ratio of representation be adopted in order to further secure the rights and interests of the people. As momentous and weighty as all the other provisions of the Constitution are and were when they were being considered in convention, only on this item and on this item alone, did Washington express his direct concern.

The foresight and penetrating wisdom of the founders of our Government have been proved repeatedly. Their guidelines and admonitions have served us well. They wanted a government of the people, by the people and for the people, not a government by anybody else. They did not envisage converting Capitol Hill to Mount Olympus.

I respectfully submit that with all this, and the very inherent nature of our Government, favorable consideration for an increase in the size of the House of Representatives is compelled.

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

(Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a report by the attorney general of the State of California, the Honorable Stanley Mosk, prepared by his assistant, Howard H. Jewel, at the request of the able Governor of that great State, the Honorable Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, relative to the John Birch Society. This report, written with an appropriate admixture of satire and earnestness, analyzes the philosophy, structure, membership, and methods of the Birchers.

Also, it contains numerous comments of a light, as well as a serious, quality that have been made with regard to this association. For the edification, illumination, and enjoyment of my colleagues, I present this report to the House:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Sacramento, Calif., July 7, 1961.

HON. EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California, State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR BROWN: Pursuant to your request of recent date, I am reporting herewith on the John Birch Society.

The cadre of the John Birch Society seems to be formed primarily of wealthy businessmen, retired military officers, and little old ladies in tennis shoes. They are bound together by an obsessive fear of communism, a word which they define to include any ideas differing from their own, even though these ideas may differ even more markedly with the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Khrushchev. In response to this fear they are willing to give up a large measure of the freedoms guaranteed them by the U.S. Constitution in favor of accepting the dictates of their "founder." They seek, by fair means or foul, to force the rest of us to follow their example. They are pathetic.

AN APPROACH TO THE BIRCH SOCIETY—COMEDY?

Many writers and spokesmen, dealing with the Birchers, have dismissed them with ridicule.

Arthur Krock, in the New York Times of April 7, 1961, suggested that, "Ridicule is becoming a lost art in American public controversies. For no citizens, however well-meaning, have made their movement and its followers a more vulnerable target to destruction through ridicule than have the founder and some of the prominent members of the John Birch Society."

Krock went on to point out that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had caused the emasculation of the old Liberty League by making the general public laugh at it. When the Liberty League's membership was published, with its glittering galaxy of multimillionaires, President Roosevelt publicly inquired with an innocent air, "just what liberties the DuPonts and General Motors had lost."

Attorney General Robert Kennedy stated that the Birch Society is "ridiculous, and I don't think anybody should pay much attention to them," and William Mauldin, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, lampooned the Birch Society with a cartoon entitled "Malice in Wonderland."

Founder Robert Welch stated during his recent California appearance that, "I do not like Chief Justice Earl Warren. He has taken the lead in converting this country to democracy." Arthur Caylor, in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, wrote that less excitement over the Birch Society is indicated ever since Birch has charged Chief Justice Warren "with bringing this country to the brink of democracy." He added that, "Anybody who starts out to fight communism in America by calling democracy 'mob rule' can assure himself of a future filled with futility."

Columnist Al Capp, in the Los Angeles Mirror, suggests: "There must be some other branch of the Federal Government, some mental health setup, which keeps its eye on groups that start off being just ridiculous, like the Nazi Party, or the old Bolsheviks, but which in time become dangerously lunatic as they did. People like that are ridiculous, it's true, and good for a laugh at a press conference. But once the nuts get organized, they can take over the asylum."

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of April 18, 1961, an article which indicated similar fears, but it considers the Birch Society "more a nuisance than a peril."

The Fulbright article states that "these people don't need condemnation, they need help. They need, each of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend, and then, perhaps, a good long rest."

The Fulbright piece suggests that the members of the Birch Society have acquired some kind of a political "virus, and have simply gotten together to share its misery."

TRAGEDY?

Other writers and spokesmen see in the Birchers a deadly menace.

Many segments of organized religion, for example, have been deeply disturbed over Birch charges of Communist infiltration.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

recommendations, the first of very few, as I have said, over a very long period represents a step in the right direction.

Here is how the editorial concludes:

It does indicate that the standards are being tightened, and pleas for trade barriers will be more carefully examined than perhaps they have been. The letter is only a straw in the wind. But the wind is blowing in the proper direction.

My goodness, Mr. Speaker, what are these people talking about—"blowing in the proper direction"? So far we have not been getting any real relief from the escape clause at all, as I have demonstrated. Does the Washington Post suggest now that it is going to be even tougher to get relief from the escape clause in the future than it has been in the past? Getting lower than 12 percent would be pretty hard to do, after all. And we are told that this is a step in the right direction? What do these people want, anyway? Do they want to ignore completely the clearly expressed intent of Congress? Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what is really projected—that no relief at all should be granted to those who are genuinely and demonstrably in need of this relief, and for whom Congress has determined relief should be provided—then we will indeed, in my judgment, be sailing into dark and dangerous waters ahead for the whole concept of reciprocal trade.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there came out of the Tariff Commission the other day another favorable decision, and this one was not by a split vote, as was the case with the baseball gloves, but by a unanimous decision. It was in behalf of the carpet industry. That is the same industry that went before the Commission 2 years ago, as I said, and got turned down this year. They saw things getting worse and they went back to the Commission to show to the Commission the increased gravity of the employment situation and presented other pertinent economic data about the decline in jobs and the tremendous rise in imports. This time the Commission reversed itself and rendered a unanimously favorable decision for the carpet industry, specifically with regard to wilton and velvet carpets, a decision which is being hailed by the way, back in my district, in Amsterdam, and elsewhere as the first real ray of light and hope that his shined on this seriously depressed economic community in many and many a year. I congratulate the Tariff Commission on their courage in reversing an earlier position. Today this decision of theirs rests on the desk of the President of the United States and I certainly hope and pray that he will speedily grant to the carpet industry the relief recommended by the Tariff Commission.

I hope so in the first place, because the city of Amsterdam desperately needs this relief. They tell me back home that if the President grants the relief recommended almost 500 jobs will be created overnight in Amsterdam. What music to the ears of a local depressed area, what a delicious tonic for those back home who wonder sometimes whether we here in Government really care any more.

And secondly, this relief should be approved. Mr. Speaker, because only by the acceptance of this kind of unanimously favorable recommendation out of the Tariff Commission can there be any assurance that the escape clause is actually working after all, and that the wind really is blowing in the proper direction, the direction Congress intended it should blow.

Mr. Speaker, let us speak frankly. The reciprocal trade program comes up for extension next year. With this kind of legislation before us, it will be most important that every Member determine whether the will of Congress has in fact been carried out in the time since Congress last acted.

Does reciprocal trade hurt domestic industry? Has the escape clause procedure which Congress provided in order to relieve these affected industries actually been administered to grant help?

Here, in the carpet case then, is a golden opportunity, it seems to me, to prove that this escape clause can and does and will be allowed to work. I am sure I speak for all of the people in my district and for many other thousands of people connected with the carpet industry and with the textile industry around the Nation, when I say we earnestly hope the decision of the President will be a favorable one, and that the recommendation of the Tariff Commission granting relief to the carpet industry will be approved. In this way American working men and women can have confidence that their Government in its concern for people overseas has not forgotten or neglected those here at home who also have proper and legitimate needs.

SIZE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, through the ages, from Plato to Locke, philosophers have theorized as to the best form of government wherein the innate best qualities of the individual can be given full and free expression.

Our forefathers crystallized and put into serviceable form the philosophies for a theoretical good government when they devised the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. By adopting a representative form of government and by asserting as basic principles of government that man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursut of happiness is a democratic institution, they gave substance and meaning to western civilization.

Through such means, and to that end, democracy became synonymous with man's highest attainment in and for self-government, and since the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, the world has seen governments rise on the promise of adopting those principles and has seen governments topple for failure to grasp or maintain them.

Today there are governments who proclaim themselves to be democratic but by their principles, organization, and practices it is clear that they are the same forms of tyranny against which man has always fought to free himself. The term "democracy" has been exploited by those who would enslave or continue the enslavement of mankind and under its guise and through deceptive practices it was used to foist communism, fascism, nazism, and every form of dictatorship and oppression upon millions of people everywhere.

However other people and other nations may be duped or betrayed, in other countries, and forced into a dictatorship, it was the will and the wisdom of the founding fathers that our true concept of a just government, of equal rights, of majority rule and minority interests, be preserved. For that purpose they determined that the House of Representatives shall be the body of the Government closest to the people so that the people shall always have unhindered access to their Government; so that the people shall always have, in their Government, an unstifled voice; so that the Government can speedily and readily determine the will of the people.

Consonant with those ideals and principles, as the country grew and as new States were admitted to the Union, this House was enlarged consistently through every decennial census since the First Congress in 1789 until the Thirteenth Census in 1910, and those increases were conformable to the thinking of the framers of the Constitution and the States that adopted it. There was one exception, in 1840, when due to a mathematical peculiarity, the House was reduced in size although the population increased and the anomaly was immediately corrected.

When the census of 1910 showed the then unprecedented increase in population from 75 million in 1900 to 91 million in 1910, an increase of 16 million in a single decade, the apportionment act of 1911 fixed the total membership of the House at the then existing figure of 435 seats which included an allowance for the contemplated admission of Arizona and New Mexico into the Union and that constituted a sizable increase over the 391 seats under the 1900 census.

From 1910 to this very date, the size of the House was fixed at 435 seats although the population increased by 31 million between 1910 and 1930, an additional 28 million between 1930 and 1950, and a further additional increase of 29 million between 1950 and 1960.

An increase of 16 million in population plus the contemplated entrance of 2 States into the Union gave rise to settling the size of the House from 391 seats to 435 seats, back in 1910. Nothing, however, was done during the intervening years while the population increased by 88 million and two more States, Alaska, and Hawaii, were admitted into the Union. Whereas the apportionment ratio per thousand increased from 194 in 1900 for a population of 75 million to 211 in 1910 for a population of 91,972,266, the present ratio is now 412, under the 1960 census,

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

As a result, some organized religious groups have taken unprecedented stands against these irresponsible attacks.

The leader of the United Presbyterian Church, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, urged members of his church to "get off the defensive and in every church begin the attack that our Nation needs to be protected from those who in their fear of communism would destroy American freedom."

In striking out at Welch and the Birchers, Blake said, "The old lies are being actively circulated by the same people who were McCarthy's stooges a few years ago but are now organized into typical totalitarian cells. His argument to trust him is that he (Welch) has a 'nose for Communists.' I don't think his nose is very accurate if he calls President Eisenhower a Communist." Following Blake's address to the sessions of the Los Angeles Presbytery on May 8, the delegates unanimously passed a resolution alerting their membership to slanderous accusations and charges of communism in the church."

In a recent appearance in California, Welch told an audience that 7,000 Protestant ministers in the Nation "can fairly be called Communists or Communist sympathizers. Protestant ministers do not become Communists, but Communists do become Protestant ministers," he said.

Responding to that accusation, a group of 137 southern California ministers published a statement assailing this blanket accusation. Said the leading ministers of southern California:

"Our churches, schools and other traditional institutions in the United States, as well as many of our beloved statesmen, educators and clergymen, have been subjected to vicious attacks by blanket accusations and by unsupported charges.

"In the present world situation it is all too easy for persons of good will to be 'conned' into taking positions and supporting methods which are actually destructive of the valid ends they seek.

"Any group or individual, however well intentioned, that promotes a program of hatred, suspicion and distrust of our free American institutions, and that indulges in the irresponsible labeling of people and institutions, is unwittingly serving the cause of those who would destroy these institutions."

ROBERT WELCH: "FOUNDER"

Robert Welch, an embittered candymaker of Belmont, Mass., and a former member of the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers, founded the John Birch Society in December of 1958 with the publication of his "Blue Book of the John Birch Society." This 179-page document blueprints the purposes and structure of the John Birch Society. All references following, unless otherwise noted, are to the Blue Book. The Blue Book is not to be confused with "The Politician," which was a "personal letter circulated to friends" and is now withdrawn from circulation. "The Politician" contains Welch's most widely quoted statement: that President Eisenhower is a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy."

"The John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels" (p. 159). "Those members who cease to feel the necessary degree of loyalty can either resign or will be put out before they build up any splintering following of their own inside the society" (p. 161). "We shall have shortcuts for eliminating (differences of opinion) without going through any congress of so-called democratic processes" (p. 162).

At the apex of this authoritarian heap is the "Founder" (always with a capital F). "I want no other title than that of its Founder" (p. 158). "(I) offer myself as a personal leader in this fight and ask you to follow that leadership" (p. 170).

These quotations from the "blue book" demonstrates the totalitarian character of the John Birch Society. They also cause one to speculate about the recent attempts to some prominent Birchers to disassociate themselves from some of Welch's more exotic statements. So far as can be ascertained, none of these attempts have met with excommunication from the Birch Society. One concludes therefore that either Welch has authorized the deviation or that he feels it is not material.

Since publishing this book, Welch has devoted his time primarily or exclusively to recruiting for the John Birch Society. Apparently, in his talks throughout the country he makes virtually the same speech which he made in Los Angeles and Santa Barbara during his recent visit to California.

Press accounts of his talk in Houston late in April indicate the identical line, and in some instances the precise expressions and phrases used in California. The New Deal was "foreign, phony, and a failure." The Communists "engineered the defeat of Robert Taft in the contest for the 1952 Republican nomination for President, at which time President Eisenhower was nominated by the Republican Party."

Welch also cascades down the tomb of the late Joe McCarthy, defending not only McCarthy's anticommunism, but, he says, "Indeed there was nothing wrong with McCarthy's methods from the point of view of the patriotic American."

In Houston, as in other communities, he declined a press conference and would not submit to questioning by members of the press or television corps. He particularly scorned representatives of newspapers that have been critical of him.

Welch also sees himself in the role of a martyr. "In this fight against vastly entrenched evil," he says, "some grow tired, some grow old, and some like myself grow bold." His whole approach, states the newspaper, the Texas Observer, suggests a "flight to amorality."

According to a number of editorial writers, wherever Robert Welch makes his speeches, he loses rather than gains popular support. Part of his difficulty stems from his refusal to submit to the normal interrogation by newspaper reporters.

As a result of his recent tour through Texas, Troy Martin, publisher of the Canyon (Tex.) News, a conservative newspaper circulated in a conservative area of Texas, wrote the following editorial:

"Even some of the stanchest members of the John Birch Society have expressed doubt in the leadership of the Society since Bob Welch, its top man, made an appearance at Amarillo Saturday. We cannot approve of this man who believes that he is the only man alive ready, willing, and able to lead the fight against communism. Welch sneers at democracy and in his blue book labels it a perennial fraud. He says a Republican form of government has many attractions under certain favorable conditions. Welch looks with suspicion upon labor, management, religion, government, newspapers, and in fact about everyone except Bob Welch. I do not believe that the American people yet have to choose between fascism and bolshevism. We must understand once and for all that there is little actual difference between fascism and bolshevism. Both are headed up by a type of latter-day nobility bent upon exploiting an enslaved people. We must fight communism, but we must also beware lest we nurture something as bad."

In assessing patriotism most Americans would feel the need for differentiating between a paid agent of the Soviet espionage apparatus on the one hand and an American who believes in fluoridation or mental health programs or the U.N. or Federal aid to education—or all four of these—on the other hand. Not so Mr. Welch. He and the Birchers angrily lump all these together under the blanket accusation of treason. There are no grays for Mr. Welch, he offers all of us the alternatives of agreement with him or treason. He concludes accordingly that the press, radio and television are dominated by Communist influence (p. 35). "It is clear that treason—and a willingness to close one's eyes to treason which is itself treasonous—were widespread in our high army circles" (p. 6). The Communists presently control the Hawaiian Islands (p. 20). "The trouble in our Southern States has been fomented almost entirely by the Communists" (p. 29). American foreign aid was planned by Communists to advance communism (p. 32).

THE PRINCIPLE OF REVERSAL

As a substitute for hard thinking on the issues some Americans have adopted the formula that, "if the Communists are for it we ought to be against it and vice versa." Welch has ruined this formula by the addition of his principle of reversal. This Alice in Wonderland concept has it that many of the things the Communists profess to be for, they are really against. They only say they are for it so that we will be against.

For example, Welch characterizes U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold as "one of the most contemptible agents of the Kremlin ever supported by the American taxpayers." When Khrushchev waxes frenetic about Hammarksjold, Welch explains that Khrushchev only does so because he wants us to defend Hammarskjold, thus keeping him at his post.

Welch tells us that many American organizations generally supposed to be anti-Communist are really Communist. "Some of them have no more harmful purpose than merely to drain off, into innocuous wastefulness, money and effort which might otherwise find its way into really patriotic and anti-Communist activities. Others are primarily designed to offer protective coloration to Communists who can thus get themselves publicized as active in anti-Communist organizations" (p. 160).

A last and perhaps even more bizarre example of the principle of reversal:

Welch believes that the real reason the Russians sent sputnik aloft was because they wanted us to increase our defense spending (pp. 33–34). "Although our danger remains almost entirely internal, from Communist influences right in our midst and treason right in our Government, the American people are being persuaded that our danger is from the outside, is from Russian military superiority. And under the excuse of preparing to match that military might, or defending ourselves from this threat of outside force; in other words, under the guise of fighting communism, we are being stampeded into the biggest jump ever toward, and perhaps the final jump right into socialism and then the Communist camp" (p. 32).

This results in a "heads they win, tails we lose" proposition of hideous proportion. If we increase American military might to resist Russia, we are playing into Russian hands. If we reduce American military might, we are playing into Russian hands. It is no wonder then that Welch and his Birchers are so frantic in their self-induced terror. Thus, Welch concludes: "that, unless we can reverse forces which now seem inexorable in their movement, (we) have only a few more years before (the United States) will become four separate provinces in a worldwide Communist domination ruled by police-state methods from the Kremlin" (p. 9).

IF IT WALKS LIKE A DUCK—

The duck formula is another device which has occasionally been used as a substitute for thinking about the issues. This canard (no pun intended) was effectively shot down

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

by the gentleman who rose to ask: "If it walks like a doctor, talks like a doctor, and looks like a doctor, would you let it operate on you?" Nevertheless, the temptation to play Welch's game in reverse by pointing out the similarities between the John Birch Society and the Communist Party is irresistible. Thus, one notes:

1. Standard Communist strategy for countries marked for takeover is to sow in those countries seeds of doubt and suspicion against the Government and leaders. Here the John Birch Society founder has accused a former President of the United States, a former Secretary of State, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Chief of CIA, and other top-ranking Government leaders with treason. Thus does the John Birch Society do the work of Communists.

2. The John Birch Society is implacably opposed to the most effective of the free world's defenses against communism. It is opposed to the Marshall plan, the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to increased military spending for the United States. Their opposition against these defenses is matched only by that of Khrushchev and Moa Tse-tung. Who is allied with whom?

3. Domestically, the John Birch Society opposes civil rights, collective bargaining, and the social gospel of religions. In the nations which they rule, the Communists oppose these also.

4. The Birch Society believes in the organization of "fronts." "We would organize fronts—little fronts, big fronts, temporary fronts, permanent fronts, all kinds of fronts" (p. 86).

Some of these fronts have recently made their appearance here in California. The Freedom Club at the University of California at Santa Barbara is one prime example. In spite of the best efforts by the leadership of the John Birch Society to prevent any identification with the Freedom Club, it was very ably exposed as a front for the John Birch Society by the Santa Barbara News-Press and by local law enforcement agencies in Santa Barbara.

After Columbia Broadcasting System Television Commentator Grant Holcomb was repulsed in his efforts to interview Welch on a telecast from Santa Barbara, Holcomb was roundly abused in correspondence from a group which called itself the committee against nihilism. Letters berating Holcomb were sent to him and also to officials of CBS. This despite the fact that any objective observer of the attempt by Holcomb to interview Welch would concede that his performance was journalistically proper and polite.

Another new organization, apparently a Birch front is called realtors for American freedom, shortened to the initials RAF.

Officers and leaders of this RAF group boast of their use of the realtors association to assert political strength in Sacramento, and they relate to their membership that through an ex-Army colonel, they have access to FBI information on suspected Communists. The RAF group is attended by even greater secrecy than the Birch Society itself.

The use of "fronts" by the Communist Party is too well known to require documentation here.

5. One of the least appealing of Welch's teachings is his open espousal of techniques which he, himself, terms "mean and dirty" (p. 96). These tactics include the disruption of peaceful public meetings.

A particularly noteworthy series of such tactics has occurred in the San Fernando Valley area of southern California.

On Saturday, April 22, four local clubs sponsored a meeting at a public school, at which a film and public discussion were planned. Seventy to eighty John Birch Society members invaded the meeting and broke into cheers and boos on signal, shouting the word "Republic" whenever a speaker referred to "democracy." The visitors interrupted and insulted the audience and speakers.

The following day, this performance by a similar group of invaders, 72 in all, disrupted a peaceful meeting of a club in Encino at the local community center. The Birch members were so vocal and abusive in their interruptions that it became necessary to call police officers in order to prevent physical violence.

Members of the Birch Society have indicated that they learn about these meetings by means of infiltration into legitimate political organizations, and that the invasion and disruption of peaceable assemblies of citizens is part of their program of action.

A particularly vicious piece of literature has been circulated by Birch Society members in the Manhattan Beach area, attacking the minister of the local Methodist church. Similar activities have been directed at schoolteachers and board of education members in many other California areas.

Again, infiltration into legitimate organizations and disruptive tactics have long been standard Communist practice.

6. The Birch Society is a monolithic authoritarian organization with the policy dictated from above and no dissent permitted in its ranks. The Communist Party is a monolithic authoritarian organization with policy dictated from above and no dissent permitted in its ranks.

Even the Russians apparently believe that Welch and the Birch Society are actively serving the Communist cause. The Literary Gazette of Moscow, under date of April 4, 1961, carried the following article in the Russian language:

"THE FUHRER WELCH AND HIS JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

"The predictions of Lenin are materializing in the course of history. Lenin predicted that the capitalistic society will strangle itself to death due to their economic and social system. This is exactly the way Lenin's predictions are coming true in the United States of America.

"Lenin said that the most ardent foes of communism will eventually become frightened and suspicious of anybody that does not agree with them. In this manner these extremely nationalistic capitalists will actually work for the cause of communism by eliminating some of the largest obstacles on the road toward a worldwide Communist way of life.

"This was true in the past and history is repeating itself again. Several years ago an American Senator by the name of McCarthy performed a great service to world communism and actually supported our cause by throwing suspicion of Communist affiliation on some very important personalities of the capitalist world. He was so involved in this particular activity that instead of harming, he actually strengthened the Communist party in the United States.

"Now the Communist movement has gained unexpectedly a new supporter. His name is Robert Welch. This former candymaker went one step further. He has published a book which compares to Hitler's Mein Kampf, in which he outlines his program. Mr. Welch calls his book 'The Politician'.

"According to Welch, John Foster Dulles was a Communist agent, and his brother Allen Dulles, the child of American intelligence, is, after Eisenhower, the second largest supporter of communism in Washington. Eisenhower's brother, Milton, is actually the boss of the American Communist Party."

(There follow description of "fronts and cells" of the Birch Society. Then, in conclusion:)

"This is the teaching of Robert Welch and his John Birch Society. Here is more proof that Lenin's teachings and predictions were correct."

Returning again to Alice in Wonderland thinking, we wonder whether the Russians say that Welch and the John Birch Society are proof that Lenin was correct because they want us to oppose Birchism. If so, we should support the Birchers and confound the Russians. On the other hand, applying the principle of reversal, perhaps they only say this to make us support the Birchers. If so, we should oppose the Birchers and confound the Russians. We can only conclude with Alice that "things are getting curiouser and curiouser."

BIRCHISM AND POLITICS

Although the Birch Society leadership has been scathingly critical of all existing political parties, there is the constant danger that it will become affiliated with an attempt to take over all or some part of one of the existing political parties.

The official Democratic Party, through its State central committee, is on record publicly repudiating the Birch Society. Most leading Republicans have taken a similar stand.

Despite the repudiation by Republican leadership, some Republican groups do give the society the encouragement of a forum. Two Republican Congressmen from southern California, EDGAR HIESTAND and JOHN ROUSSELOT, have admitted membership in the organization. After an original equivocal denial of his membership, Congressman ROUSSELOT has become a most ardent advocate of the Birch Society and is frequently quoted in the press as making speeches in defense of it.

The fact of their membership in the Birch Society was not publicly known at the time these two Congressmen were elected. Whether these men subscribe to the dogma of the John Birch Society as laid down by Robert Welch in the Blue Book; whether dual membership in the John Birch Society and the Republican Party is intellectually compatible, are matters which their constituents may want to ascertain should either of these two Congressmen seek reelection.

Welch says: "We shall have to use politicians, support politicians, create politicians and help the best ones we can find to get elected. I am thoroughly convinced, however, that we cannot count on politicians, political leadership, or even political action except as a part of something much deeper and broader, to save us" (p. 124). Elsewhere in the blue book Welch makes it clear that his distrust stems from the inability of politicians to swallow the entire Birch mystic since they must apply themselves to "extraneous" matters, i.e., they must get elected.

To date, Welch and the Birchers have flirted alternately with the idea of creating a third party and with attempts to infiltrate the Republican Party. These flirtations have produced nothing more than a cold shoulder.

WHITHER BIRCHISM?

As is apparent, the entire Birch phenomenon is redolent with strong overtones of paranoia, with the "Communists" replacing the more conventional paranoid "they."

For the paranoid, life is a nightmare. Only he can see the enemy. Only he understand the nature of the peril. The more he acts upon his systematized delusions, the more he is cast out by his fellow man for his oddness. This only serves to feed and confirm his dark suspicions and moves him to every more bizarre beliefs. As these beliefs become every more bizarre, he is ever more the outcast. The circle goes round and round centripetally until swept into a vortex of fanaticism and despair.

This, we predict, is the rock upon which the Birchers and their "founder" will founder. Some examples:

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

A few weeks ago, newspapers carried a UPI story stating that a prominent Bircher, at a conservative convention in Chicago, had rejected BARRY GOLDWATER for his "socialism." Early in May, Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, addressed the Senate of the United States and stated that the John Birch Society's White Book now accuses the U.S. Chamber of Commerce of having been "permeated with leftists" because its course of practical politics indicates that "liberals and internationalists" have the best chance of winning elections.

When such examples as Senator GOLDWATER and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are cast out of the conservative camp, what leadership remains? Only Mr. Welch.

The Blue Book makes it clear that individual members of the Birch Society are to have no say in determining what communism is, nor in who is a Communist. This will be done for them by Mr. Welch (e.g., pp. 160–162).

Each day piles up additional evidence of Welch's belief that he is the only true messiah to rescue America from her enemies. It is a short step from this to the assertion that anybody who opposes Welch opposes America. Since these delusions are not the result of reason but spring instead from emotional needs, there is no rational stopping point for them. With the passage of time, we predict that the Birchers will become more splintered and the internecine warfare more intense as they interpret normal differences of opinion between themselves as treason and thence attack their opponent as not only wrong but immoral as well.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Having thus divested myself of some personal observations on the John Birch Society, I must hasten to add that they are just that—personal observations. As Attorney General, I am the chief law officer of the State. It might therefore be assumed by some that I am officially passing on the merits or demerits of the John Birch Society; that I am permitting or proscribing the propagation of their dogma; or that I am "investigating" them to determine whether they should be silenced or put in jail. Such an assumption betokens an unfamiliarity with the U.S. Constitution. The Birch Society has an equal right with the Prohibitionists, the Vegetarians, the Republicans, the Democrats, or, for that matter, with any American, acting singly or in a group to an expression of its views; and no official, no matter how highly placed, can say them nay. In America, preposterousness prevents the acceptance but not the expression of ideas.

As attorney general, I have no greater right, but no less a right, to an expression of my personal opinion than any other Californian. This is the right of which I avail myself here. Accordingly, we have not conducted an investigation of the John Birch Society, nor do we intend to—we are not "Birch Watchers." All of the material in this report has either been in the public press or was voluntarily submitted by interested citizens. One effort by Department of Justice employees to interview Robert Welch and obtain his version of Birch Society activities was met with a crude rebuff. This is in strange contrast to subsequent demands by Congressman HIESTAND and other Birchers for "an investigation."

Should there be violations of California law, as for example the disruption of public meetings, I am confident that local law enforcement will know how to handle the situation.

These, too, are parlous times for America. There is no minimizing the threat to our free institutions. The cold war goes on and a hot war, hot to the temperatures of fusion and fission, menaces the future. Under such circumstances a patient, day-by-day analysis of facts is rendered difficult. Temptation is great to stop thinking, assign all evil to the enemy, arrogate all virtue to ourselves, and comfort ourselves in righteous hatred. The Birchers have succumbed to this temptation.

From time to time I receive enquiries concerning various groups and organizations. Some are concerned with the John Birch Society, many are concerned with organizations generally thought to be closely allied with the Communist Party. These writers generally want to know whether the given organization is "all right." They want the imprimatur of the attorney general to certain themselves.

While it might seem flattering to be the repository of such faith, it seems to me that these writers have failed to come to grips with their duty as citizens. That duty, as I conceive it, is for those persons to make the investigation for themselves, being more self-reliant and leaning less upon the label that somebody else affixes to a person or organization. Accordingly, I generally advise such persons to look into the organization, listen to the ideas espoused, see the people espousing them, and ask questions. Then they can decide whether to join or oppose the organization or simply stay home and watch television.

Such a course of action is, of course, grounded in a firm belief in the superiority of democracy. Understandably, neither Welch nor the Communists brook dissention or the discussion which its its progenitor. Just as understandably, supporters of democracy welcome such discussion, for they know that a discussion which pits the philosophy of birchism or communism against that of democracy can only serve to strengthen democracy, and they know that strengthening democracy is the best weapon against communism. If the day ever dawns when democracy fears to take on all comers in the field of competing ideas, then democracy will already have died.

Mr. Welch says: "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud" (p 159). A century ago, a giant of an American, Walt Whitman, writing on the same subject, said:

"Democracy, while weapons were everywhere aim'd at your breast, I saw you serenely give birth to immortal children, saw in dreams your dilating form, saw you with spreading mantle covering the world."

Respectfully yours,

STANLEY MOSK,
Attorney General.
By HOWARD H. JEWEL,
Assistant Attorney General.

CREATION OF U.S. DISARMAMENT AGENCY FOR WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with 52 of my House colleagues by filing a bill, recommended by President Kennedy, to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. It am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation which has bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. Former President Eisenhower has also endorsed the idea of an independent Disarmament Agency with legislative authorization. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee today is holding hearings on this legislation and I hope that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will schedule its hearings soon.

In my opinion this is one of the most important measures to come before this Congress and should be enacted before we adjourn. An ultimate goal of the United States is a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments; in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law; and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is the purpose of this act, as outlined in section 2, to provide impetus toward this goal by creating a new agency of peace to deal with the problem of disarmament.

President Kennedy, in his message to Congress proposing the creation of the Disarmament Agency, went to the heart of the issue in these words:

Peace cannot be brought about by concentrating solely on measures to control and eliminate weapons. It must also encompass measures to sustain and strengthen institutions and the rule of law. A disarmament program must take into account the national security, our foreign policy, the relationships of this country to international peace-keeping agencies, including the United Nations, and our domestic, economic, and other policies. It should drive toward the creation of a peaceful world society in which disarmament, except for the forces needed to apply international sanctions, is the accepted condition of international life.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit an editorial in today's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Proclaiming Our Hope," and columnist Roscoe Drummond's article in yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Disarmament Agency Is Urgently Needed":

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 15, 1961]

PROCLAIMING OUR HOPE

Paradoxical as it may seem in view of Mr. Khrushchev's bluster, now is precisely the time when this country needs legislation establishing a U.S. Disarmament Agency. Fourteen Senators and 51 Representatives have sponsored a bill to this end in response to President Kennedy's request, and hearings in the Senate began yesterday. The measure ought to be approved promptly.

The reason for speed is partly tactical. It is plain enough that this fall the Soviet challenge to the United States in the United Nations and elsewhere will be a total one, using every element of pressure and propaganda. One of the major efforts of Soviet propaganda has been to advertise general and complete disarmament—which has never been more than a slogan—and to depict the United States as a warmonger because it insists upon looking at details. As part of the plan to take the initiative, it is important for this country to have a regularized agency to emphasize its own fond hope of graduated and controlled disarmament.

More than this, as a matter of organization, disarmament planning has been spread thin over many agencies. Not until the last year has there been an effort to centralize policy responsibility and research studies. On more than one occasion in the past, contradictions and lack of coordination may have persuaded the Soviet Union that this country was not serious. A statutory agency will have the authority and prestige to obtain cooperation in determining what is feasible and what is not—and that is the only basis upon which disarmament can ever become more than a slogan.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 1961]

DISARMAMENT AGENCY IS URGENTLY NEEDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Can President Kennedy expect to mobilize congressional support for a vast, new, more armaments program, and at the same time

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

mobilize congressional support for a vast, new, disarmament program?

If the present need is for an all-out effort to build military strength, is this the time for an all-out effort to get everybody to agree to decrease military strength?

Since the Soviets have rejected any inspection they cannot veto and since we will not accept disarmament we cannot inspect, is this whole disarmament exercise so meaningless that we might as well put it in charge of an office boy?

In other words, should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lean back and yawn as it takes testimony this week on the proposed new U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security—or should it sit bolt upright in the conviction that this is urgent, imperative, and significant business?

I believe that creating the proposed Disarmament Agency is urgent, imperative, and significant business.

My conviction is that the Congress will be making a grave mistake if it passes over this present opportunity to make the cause of world arms control—and disarmament—a major American concern with an agency operating at the highest level of Government, manned by the most competent people the President can command in order to devise the soundest conceivable program.

There are solid reasons why, despite surface appearances to the contrary, the Disarmament Agency is timely and needed:

1. Disarmament is a worldwide preoccupation. It is a deep and abiding concern for millions and millions of people—and rightly. The prospects of disarmament may be more difficult and more remote than the most wishful think and less difficult and less remote than the most cynical think. It may be as remote and difficult as getting to outer space seemed a decade ago.

2. Discussion and debate on disarmament are not going to be adjourned because there is fighting in Laos, tension in Berlin, or conflict in the Conga. There have been almost continuous disarmament negotiations with the Soviets for the past 4 years. The United States has not been well prepared for these negotiations. It's time we were.

3. Sometime there has got to be a will and a method to control the horrendous weapons. A balance of military strength is safer than an imbalance but an uncontrolled thermonuclear arms race could explode any time and something like 100 million casualties would be part of the consequence.

4. Of course we won't get disarmament until there is a change of attitude on the part of the Soviets on inspection and control. But regardless of the attitude of the Soviets—even if they only talk about it on Sunday and run away from it on Monday—the United States ought to be ready with the most practicable, thoroughly considered, wisely devised, and workable disarmament program which our best brains can produce. Our position on this matter before the whole world ought to be positive, constructive, and compelling.

John J. McCloy, the President's disarmament adviser and one of the Nation's ablest public servants, and William C. Foster, who will probably succeed him, are convinced that the proposed new Disarmament Agency is the best means of achieving all these purposes.

OUTER MONGOLIA

(Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. LATTA) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD).

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have, since the first of this year, supported any part of the administration's program whenever I sincerely felt it would advance the cause of our individual freedom. On the other hand I have opposed any policies, legislation and actions which in my honest judgment did not serve the best interests of the American people.

In line with this policy, I wish to applaud the administration's recent announcement that it was suspending its negotiations to establish diplomatic relations with the central Asian Communist State of Outer Mongolia. I, too, feel that in view of the present world situation and because Mongolia is a satellite of Soviet Russia, functioning as an independent Communist country under the Soviet system, that it is definitely within the best interest of the United States to suspend any further consideration of this matter at this time.

In support of the President's recent announcement, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that diplomatic recognition should not be extended to the Mongolian People's Republic.

METROPOLITAN OPERA

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. LATTA) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of my colleagues are aware that the Metropolitan Opera Co. has announced the cancellation of its coming season.

Although the Met is located in the city of New York, and in my congressional district, the effects of the announced cancellation will be felt in all parts of the country. For, in addition to the cancellation of its regular season, the Met will have to forgo its 7-week spring tour of 1962 scheduled to bring the company to Boston, Cleveland, Atlanta, Dallas, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Detroit, and Toronto. And, of course, the opera broadcasts which have been a source of pleasure and enchantment for so many years would also be affected by a cancellation of the coming season.

Many of the most distinguished artists of our time consider it a privilege to appear with the company. Through its frequent appearances and numerous recordings it has won friends for the United States in all parts of the world. Hence, it is one of our Nation's greatest cultural assets.

What is involved here is much more than a labor-management dispute over a wage increase between the officials of the Metropolitan Opera Co. and local 802 of the American Federation of Musicians. There are larger issues at stake. For the Met is faced with rising costs and heavily mounting deficits—now close to $1 million a year—an amount which its patrons are finding extremely difficult to meet. The Met is also faced with an increasing inability to provide its musicians with a wage commensurate with their artistic standing in the community. The upshot is that the cost of attending the opera is all but prohibitive for the general public who are always the losers in the end.

In the meantime, steps have been taken in an attempt to bring the opposing sides in the dispute to some sort of agreement. Mayor Wagner has persuaded both sides to continue discussions. President Kennedy has directed Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, to place his personal mediation services at the disposal of the disputants. Negotiations are continuing at this very moment. Slight progress had been made by the weekend and there is a general feeling that an early settlement, albeit a temporary one, is not outside the realm of possibility.

Mr. Speaker, both in 1948 and 1960 the Met announced cancellation of its season and both times the seasons were saved at the last moment. It is my earnest hope that once again reasonable men will overcome their differences and settle this dispute and that come 8 p.m. October 23 the hall of the Metropolitan Opera House will be filled, the musicians will be in their customary places in the pit and that the 77th season of the Met will be off to a glorious start.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

(Mr. DURNO (at the request of Mr. LATTA) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago at the close of mankind's most devastating war, in an unprecedented gesture of national generosity and maturity, this country embarked upon a vast financial program to help both allies and former enemies regain a sound economic status and, in some cases, improve upon their prewar economy.

Initially, foreign aid was presented to the Congress as a temporary program, one which would end as each country regained its footing. Over these years, American aid has been extended to virtually every nation—new, old, and reorganized at a cost of nearly $90 billion—and no end to the program is in sight.

To a large extent the foreign aid program is inextricably interwoven with our global strategy for defense of the free world and our own survival. It is not now possible to abruptly end our heavy financial burdens in this area. I hope, however, that we can set our sights on a logical and gradual withdrawal from this type of support as the countries aided are put in a position to carry more of the cost of their own development.

We have before us an issue which overshadows the arguments pro and con on foreign aid which have developed over the years. This year the President has proposed a 5-year program for aid to underdeveloped countries. He has requested authority to borrow $8.8 billion from the Treasury to finance the program. This is a departure from the normal procedure which has very serious implications.

The validity of the argument for authority to proceed with the development assistance program for a period beyond annual authorizations is recognized. The long-range character of plans for the development of the economic resources and productive capacities of underdeveloped countries requires assurance of continuity of effort over a reasonable period of time. There is need for a method that will provide this assurance. At the same time, the Members of Congress must discharge their constitutional ob-

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

John Birch
1961
Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

"Shun Birch Society Like Plague," Doctors Advised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to see the rising tide of public opinion against the John Birch Society. Recently the Wisconsin State Medical Society has added its voice to those warning against this extremist organization. In an editorial in the June issue of the Wisconsin Medical Journal they urge doctors to diagnose political evil with the same care used for physical ills.

The full text of the editorial follows:

The crackpot, the crank and the common, garden-variety screwball have always been characteristic of our democracy. Viewed as a fragment of the lunatic fringe, the John Birch Society may seem more ridiculous than worthy of concern. But what this group and its wealthy leader and founder, Robert Welch, stand for will produce a sick sensation in the stomach of every patriotic American.

The information that prominent medical men in several communities have associated themselves with the John Birch Society causes dismay and consternation among doctors of sense and perception.

The John Birch Society purports to fight communism. To do this it organizes secret and semi-secret groups who look around their own communities for Communists to expose. The society's Blue Book urges mean and dirty techniques, underground infiltration, front organizations, and, in fact, all the methods the Communists themselves use.

Among the Americans whom Robert Welch, a retired candy manufacturer, thinks might be members of the Communist underground were President Eisenhower, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his brother, Allen Dulles, now head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The John Birch Society is, in its structure, frankly authoritarian. It insists that there be no accounting of the funds contributed to it "for reasons you will understand." It regards democracy as a weapon of demogoguery and a perennial fraud.

Naturally, this kind of a setup has attracted such characters as J. B. Matthews, one-time supersleuth for the late Senator Joseph B. McCarthy, who got fired from his job for picking on American clergymen as supporters of the Communist apparatus.

It gathers the perennial paranoiac who sees a conspiracy against him in every healthy, happy development of our Nation.

It is readymade for that slimy corruption of the body politic that would disgrace the underside of a rock. It is the apotheosis of the Silver Shirts, the American Vigilantes, the Crusaders for Economic Liberty and other demented hate groups of the 1930's and early 1940's, and it draws together the survivors of these unfortunate, but happily defunct organizations.

Cloaked with a phony respectability and supported by big money, the organizers of the John Birch Society would make such fellow operators as Gerald L. K. Smith, William D. Pedley and Gerald Winrod turn green with envy.

That a few medical men, who, of all people, should have a sense of balance and be perceptive to social disruption for ulterior motives, are members of the John Birch Society or its affiliates, is a disgrace to the entire profession.

There is room in our democracy for difference of opinion, and, as a Nation, we exercise our right to dissent almost to the point of license. But there is no room for the betrayal of our ideals, and the John Birch Society is an avowed opponent of the democratic ideal expressed in a republican form of government.

It says it is anti-Communist; it is really antidemocratic. Robert Welch and his minions call themselves ultraconservative. They take as their heroes the late Senator Robert Taft and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Senator Taft can't defend himself and General MacArthur has not yet commented.

But there is no question, after what has happened in communities like Glenview, Ill., and Santa Barbara, Calif.: the John Birch Society is antidemocratic. Its theme is hate, its method disruption. Like the Nazi Party in Germany, it uses anticommunism as a tool to establish a totalitarian America.

Hunting traitors, Communists or any other kind, is the business of the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Over the years, these organizations have done their job well—far better than local loud-mouths who looked for Communist propaganda in Girl Scout handbooks and found enemy agents where none existed.

This country does not need private vigilante groups to protect our institutions. We don't need the John Birch Society and its conspiratorial methods. Our country is strong in its faith, firm in its ideals, and steadfast in its devotion to the principles which the John Birch Society abhors.

It is to be hoped that the doctors who have allowed their names to be used by the John Birch Society are innocent victims of misinformation. Let them serve as examples for the rest of us who love our country and cherish democracy. Let us beware of being deceived by high-sounding, superpatriotic organizations whose ultimate aim is the destruction of our Nation.

Let us use the same perception in the diagnosis of political evil that we would use in the diagnosis of physical maladies.

Let us shun the John Birch Society and its front organizations like the plague.

A Minister Looks at Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the sermon which follows would appear to be a calm, deliberate, and thoughtful appraisal of one of the most vital and far-reaching decisions this Congress will be called upon to make during this session.

I commend it to all as required reading:

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL QUESTION

(Galatians 5: 1. Sermon preached June 11, 1961, at First Christian Church by Paul A. Remick)

For some months now a controversial church-state issue has been boiling. It has centered around the question of whether or not Federal aid should be given to private and parochial schools. According to a news release this past week the issue is scheduled to reach a crisis beginning June 20 when House leaders plan to call up the public school bill for floor action in the U.S. Congress.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the controversial Negro Baptist minister from New York City, who serves as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, has promised to do all that he can to see that private and parochial schools receive Federal aid.

At the beginning of what I have to say this morning, let me state quite clearly that there are two separate issues involved in the whole matter of Federal aid to education. The one involves Federal encroachment upon what has been up to the present moment a State or local responsibility. The other issue involves church-state relationships. While I have some real convictions about the first issue, I shall limit what I have to say this morning to the second.

This is not the first time the church-state issue has been raised in this country. It has been raised repeatedly. This time, however, it has been raised with more vehemence than ever before. For example, it was a very live issue in last year's presidential campaign, and the stand President Kennedy took probably did more for his election than any other one issue upon which he took a stand.

Often I am asked: Why all the fuss about this issue? Shouldn't everybody receive their fair share of the tax dollars? Often the issue has been presented as one of injustice. Cardinal Spellman has done a good job of this through the picture that he persists in painting of the poor little Catholic boy, standing in the rain getting wet, while the public school bus passes him by, refusing to pick him up and drop him off at the corner near his church's school. This illustration may thump heartstrings, but it evades the basic issue involved. The issue is basically and fundamentally a church-state one.

You see, one of the main reasons why many of our forefathers came to this country in the first place is because they lived under oppression by the church. Massachusetts, for example, was colonized by separatists who had broken away from the Church of England and suffered persecution at the hands of King James I. The Puritans were another group that left England for the same reason and settled in various parts of New England. Roger Williams, the great colonial Baptist leader, founded Rhode Island because of religious persecution. George Calvert founded Maryland because, following his embracement of the Roman Catholic faith, he was cut off from all chances of political preferment at home. Religious freedom for the Quakers figured in the founding of our own State of Pennsylvania by William Penn. The founding of Georgia by James Oglethorpe is another example of a colony brought into being for religious freedom. Either directly or indirectly religion played an important part in the colonizing of virtually every part of the New World.

Because many of our forefathers experienced religious persecution in England and on the Continent from the state churches the very first amendment to the Constitution of the newly formed Thirteen Colonies was made to read: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It is the very first sentence of the amendment to the Constitution that bears on the issue being considered this morning. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion * * *."

Any church has a perfect right to promote marriage between church and state.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

The Roman Catholic Church is not alone in this belief. All of the Eastern Orthodox Churches have practiced this for centuries. In fact, the Eastern Orthodox Churches are not particularly known separate and apart from their state relationships. They are known as the Greek Orthodox Church, the Russian Orthodox Church, the Serbian Orthodox Church, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, and so on.

In the Scandinavian countries the same thing is true of Lutheranism. For example, the Lutheran Church is the state church in Norway, in Sweden, in Denmark, and in Finland. In England, the Church of England has held a close tie with government, being the state church.

While various Christian groups have embraced the idea of marriage between church and state, the Roman Catholic Church has been the most vigorous exponent of the idea down throughout the centuries. In almost every country where the majority of the population are members of the Roman Catholic Church, that church holds the position of being the state church.

This is Roman Catholic doctrine. Since the time of St. Augustine in the fifth century, and his "City of God," a writing which pictures Christian society synonymous with the organized church, Roman Catholic doctrine has maintained that "The Earthly City" has no right to exist unless it is definitely subordinate to the "City of God." Regardless of what many of our Roman Catholic brethren may say about it never happening in the United States, history has proven over and over again that whenever the majority of the population becomes Roman Catholic that church becomes the state church.

Whenever this issue is raised in this country we are always accused by the Roman Catholic hierarchy as being either intolerant or bigoted. Harold Bosley tells the story of two brothers who would fight among themselves from time to time. One day they were fighting underneath the kitchen window. Hearing the conflict, the mother called to the older boy, "Tommy, what's the matter?" Tommy replied, "Make Johnny stop fighting." Tearfully Johnny replied, "I'm not fighting, Mommy, I'm just fighting back."

In the present conflict we are just fighting back. We are trying to preserve a basic principle upon which our country was established and upon which we believe has made our country great, and it is this principle of separation between church and state.

Please do not misunderstand me, the Roman Catholic Church has a perfect right to believe that the state should be the arm of the church. Furthermore, it is that church's privilege to do all within its power through nonviolent persuasion to accomplish that end. But by the same right we have the privilege to work for the maintenance of separation between church and state. To this end many of us within the Protestant Church intend to work toward and try to preserve.

You may be asking at this point, "How does all of this that I have said apply to the public school question?" Few people realize that the public school system is uniquely American. Our country was the first to provide equal opportunity for education to all, regardless of race, color, or creed. Granted, this has not been fully realized, but we were the first to at least make the big step in that direction.

You see, prior to the development of the public school system, education was considered a luxury and provided for only a few. If you read back into the pages of history, you will discover that religious groups were the first to initiate education. The education that they initiated, however, was primarily for religious instruction—in other words, to propagate the faith.

During the Dark Ages, the only formal education given any serious attention was that designed for the priesthood. As the enlightenment dawned in the 16th and 17th centuries, however, there developed a real need for more formal education. The New World, with it's courage and desire to venture forth into the unknown, took seriously the great dreams of Jean Rousseau and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and established free, public and compulsory education for all.

Our forefathers had experienced the private and parochial approach to education in the countries from which they came, and at the outset they committed themselves not to allow this approach to education to take charge here. With great courage, and with much opposition, they established the system of education we presently enjoy in this country. My friends, to allow any other system of education to have equal status is to destroy that system of education which has made our country great.

In the June issue of Church and State a report is given as to what has happened in a number of countries where tax money has gone for the support of both public and private schools. In the Netherlands, for example, it is reported that "public support for sectarian and private schools has reduced the public schools to a minority level. Public funds pay all the costs (for all the various school systems). * * * In primary grades, Catholics enroll 43 percent of the pupils, Protestants 27 percent, and public schools have 28 percent. The remaining 2 percent are in nonsectarian private schools."

You see, the American way of life has never been a sectarian approach. There has nearly always been freedom for the individual to worship God as he sees fit in the church or synagogue of his choice, to believe what he likes, and through the democratic way to integrate the best of all the various cultures, points of view, ways of doing things, into the American way of life.

One leading Protestant church leader declares, "Once Federal funds go to parochial schools, the face of America will be quickly changed. There will soon be sectarian candidates and parties at State and local levels. Within a century the American people will be more divided than by the present conflict over the race issue."

There are many Protestant educators who are warning that if Federal aid to private and parochial schools becomes a reality on a large scale, virtually every Protestant building of any size in the United States will become the nucleus of a Protestant Christian Day School. Instead of uniting our country this will further divide it. All of us know we are divided enough at the present time.

As I have reiterated throughout the sermon this morning, the Roman Catholic Church has a perfect right to maintain it's parochial school system, but let it be maintained at it's own expense, not at the expense of the American people.

In his answer to the editorial which appeared in Life magazine several weeks ago—an editorial charging that Roman Catholics are being discriminated against with the present financial structure in education—Henry P. Van Dusen, president of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, wrote: "Discrimination occurs only where equal opportunities are not offered to all on equal terms, as in racial segregation in a school system. Equal opportunity for all on equal terms is precisely what public schools provide and what Federal aid to public education would strengthen.

I may prefer private medical attendance and service to the city's hospitals but I am not discriminated against if tax funds are not available to my doctor or hospital. I may prefer private playgrounds to the community's recreation facilities but I am not discriminated against if community tax funds are not available to my club. I may prefer private schools for my children but neither they nor I am discriminated against because these schools are not supported from public funds. By no legitimate stretch of meaning can discrimination be charged."

It was certainly refreshing to see the Supreme Court refuse to review a decision handed down by the Vermont State Supreme Court, holding that it is unconstitutional for a school district to pay tuition for students to attend private religious schools even when the school district does not maintain a high school of its own and pays tuition for other students to attend nearby public high schools. This decision, however, does not settle the matter. While the Supreme Court's refusal to review the case suggests that it believes public funds given to parochial schools unconstitutional, the Court has not said so in a clear-cut decision. And until such time as the Supreme Court hands down such a decision the battle will continue. Furthermore, there is always the possibility that the first amendment to the Constitution may be changed as was true in 1933 when the 18th amendment was repealed.

Unfortunately this fight over the separation of church and state is going to go on; and it is going to go on just as long as any religious group, whether it be Roman Catholic or Protestant, insists that its group receive public funds to support its program.

You who know me well know that I am not anti-Catholic. I certainly trust that what I have been saying this morning will not be interpreted as such. As you know I am just as outspoken in my criticism of policies related to my own brotherhood as I am toward those of others. My reasoning may be right, or it may be wrong, but God is my judge. And so long as I feel that I am being led by God's spirit to speak on certain basic issues confronting His Church and His world, I intend to speak. On this issue of separation of church and state, I believe the Bible as some clear-cut things to say. To this point I intend to speak in September.

I urge you to give serious thought to this matter of Federal aid to private and parochial schools. Your church board did last month and communicated its action to Senators JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT and Representative GEORGE GOODLING. You can do the same, especially to GEORGE GOODLING, who is the Representative for Cumberland and York Counties, and JOHN C. KUNKEL, who is the Representative for Dauphin and Perry Counties, as this issue will reach a crisis beginning June 20, when House leaders call up the public school bill for floor action.

To the Galatians, and this is my text for today, the Apostle Paul wrote:

"For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery."

Hon. George Bender

SPEECH
OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1961

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that we learned of the passing of our former colleague

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

consideration of Calendar No. 337, H.R. 3572.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3572) to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is the policy of Congress that the value of all Federal property heretofore or hereafter given to an Indian tribe, band, or group, including the property granted by this Act, shall be considered by the Indian Claims Commission for setoff purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050). In order to incorporate that policy in the Indian Claims Commission Act, the third paragraph of section 2 of said Act is amended by deleting the words "the Commission may also inquire into and consider all money or property given to our funds expended gratuitously for the benefit of the claimant" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Commission shall also inquire into and consider all money or property given to or funds expended gratuitously for the benefit of the claimant prior to the Commission's award".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that a portion of the report on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3572 is to place in trust status 1,276.25 acres of federally owned lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota. The committee amendment, set forth in section 2, provides that the Indian Claims Commission shall determine whether the value of these lands, and other lands donated to other tribes, should be an offset against any claim against the United States allowed by the Commission in favor of the tribe that has been the beneficiary of such a gift.

NEED

The land was purchased in 1944 for $5,760 with Federal funds from an account called "Indian money, proceeds of labor." The money was accumulated from the cattle-raising activities at the Crow Creek Indian school which closed in 1954. The General Services Administration will dispose of the acreage if it is not donated to the tribe. GSA has received a firm bid which is being held in abeyance pending early congressional approval of this bill. The tribe plans to lease the land for grazing purposes. This will produce an income of about $1,200 a year for the tribe. The tribe will lose much of its present land in connection with the construction of Big Bend Dam on the Missouri River, and the lands donated by this act will provide some homesites for dislocated Indians.

COST

Enactment of the bill will require no appropriations, but will result in the loss of the amount of the bid ($29,363) which has been received by the General Services Administration.

AMENDMENTS

As passed by the House, H.R. 3572 did not specify how this gift of land would be treated in connection with the claim of the Crow Tribe now before the Indian Claims Commission.

A number of the bills donating surplus Federal lands to Indian tribes which have come before the committee contain language specifying how gifts of lands shall be considered in relation to such tribal claims. In some cases the lands are simply eliminated from the suits. In other instances there is a provision for a setoff against any claim recovered by the tribe of the present market value of the land. In other instances no mention is made of whether a setoff shall apply. Also, there is uncertainty whether gifts of land made subsequent to the cutoff date for filing claims (August 13, 1951) should be considered as offsets.

In an effort to arrive at uniformity in this regard the committee has reported several such bills, amended, to provide for setoffs. However, in order to preclude the need for such amendments, and to establish a policy that all gifts of land are considered, the committee recommends general language directing the Indian Claims Commission to determine, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the 1946 Indian Claims Commission Act, the extent to which the value of the property given to the Indians should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

This directive applies not only to the land involved in H.R. 3572 but to all gifts of Federal property to an Indian tribe. It is the committee's belief that the Indian Claims Commission is in the best position to examine all of the factors surrounding the claims of the tribes and to decide on the merits whether any setoff should be made against any judgment awarded the tribes. Moreover, the Claims Commission Act gives the Commission authority to determine setoffs generally, after examining all of the equities involved, and it seems appropriate to leave that function with the Commission, with the clarifying language of the committee amendment, rather than for Congress to attempt to determine the equities.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report from the Secretary of the Interior dated March 10, 1961, follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. March 10, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 3572, a bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

We recommend that the bill be enacted.

The bill donates to the Crow Tribe and places in a trust status approximately 1,276.25 acres of federally owned land.

The land was purchased by the Federal Government with funds from an account called "Indian money, proceeds of labor." These are Federal funds (not Indian) derived from Federal operations on Indian reservations which are not required to be disposed of in some other manner. The money in this account may be expended by the Secretary under an indefinite and continuing appropriation for the benefit of the Indians, the agency, or the Indian school on whose behalf the money is collected (25 U.S.C. 155). The money is accumulated from such activities as the operation of a beef or dairy herd in connection with an Indian school.

The purchase was made in 1944 and the purchase price was $5,760. There are no improvements on the land.

The land was purchased for use in connection with the Crow Creek school, which was an agricultural high school specializing in beef cattle production. The school was closed in 1954, and in 1957 the land was declared to the General Services Administration as excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks applied to the General Services Administration on June 16, 1958, for a transfer of the land to it under the act of May 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 240). That act authorizes the transfer if the property is found to be chiefly valuable for wildlife conservation purposes (other than conservation of migratory birds). The State's application was denied by the General Services Administration on the ground that the land is not chiefly valuable for wildlife conservation purposes.

The General Services Administration later offered the land for sale on the open market as surplus property, and we are informed that it has received a bid of $29,363 which is limited to 60 days from January 24, 1961.

The land is located near Fort Thompson, Buffalo County, S. Dak., within the exterior boundaries of the Crow Creek Reservation. The tracts are contiguous to each other (but not in a solid block) and are surrounded by allotted land. The tribe wants the land to lease for grazing purposes. Anticipated rentals are estimated to be about $1,200 per year. The land may also provide a limited number of homesites for some of the Indians who have been forced to move from the taking area of the Big Bend Dam.

We believe that the land should be given to the Indian tribe for grazing and homesite use, rather than sold as surplus property.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an interesting book review which appeared in the May 20, 1961, issue of the New Yorker magazine. The title of the review is "The Candy Kid." It attempts to evaluate the so-called blue book of the John Birch Society.

Because of the candidness of the review, because of the broad perspective in which the blue book is assessed, I ask unanimous consent that the review be included in its entirety in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CANDY KID

(By A. J. Liebling)

In 1922, when I was 18 and it was new, I read James Elroy Flecker's play about Hassan, the confectioner of Baghdad, and it became one of my clandestine addictions, like

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

creased production 31 percent above prewar. This increase was stimulated by high support prices and a multitude of subsidies as well as by technological progress. Import restrictions originally imposed for balance-of-payment reasons have been continued for protective purposes. State trading practices, mixing regulations, skimmings, and a variety of other devices have also been used to protect European farm production and oilseed processors.

Compared with the present agricultural and trade policies of the major European Economic Community countries, the Commission proposals for a common agricultural policy have certain good features.

On the other hand, the proposals would, as a means of supplementing internal price support programs, continue certain protective devices now employed by European Economic Community countries and in some cases extend their use to all six countries.

Is it not time that U.S. soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and other oils and fats enter Western European markets under freely competitive conditions? We ask no special favors for oilseed products except that they enter under the same conditions as the raw material. We are willing to compete on equal terms. As you know we are not subsidized.

We in the United States prefer processing be determined by economics and not by Government intervention. European crushers have completely free access to our raw materials—we should have no duties on our oil to Europe. Economics of freight alone are sufficient to favor raw material so long as the destination market exists for both oil and meal.

What we would like is true reciprocity with the Western European nations.

Failure to provide equal opportunity for these oil imports will fan the flames of protectionism in the United States, already concerned with balance-of-payment problems. This is not helpful. Special advantage does not sow the seeds of brotherhood.

You can help by urging your governments to move in the direction of greater liberalization for mutually beneficial trade. In addition, the special export programs help to support this effort of using food for peace. A small percentage of the foreign currencies being generated under our Public Law 480, title 1 sales are being used in market promotion projects in many of the economically developed countries. All sellers benefit from these market promotion projects.

In our field, the Soybean Council of America, jointly financed by the American Soybean Processors and counterpart Public Law 480 funds, carries on promotional activities in many parts of the world. Promotional activities, I repeat, benefit all producers and processors of oil seeds.

Special Government export activities include Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies, donations, and barter, as well as Mutual Security Act economic aid and sales for foreign currencies. About 30 percent of total U.S. agricultural exports are moved under the special programs. These constitute the foundation of the food-for-peace program.

Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies constitute the largest single segment of the special programs. By authorizing such sales of U.S. farm products to countries lacking foreign currencies, Public Law 480 has widened farm market outlets and has increased availability of food and fiber to our friends abroad.

The Mutual Security Act, like Public Law 480, also authorizes sales for foreign currencies. From 1954 through 1959 the United States sold about $1.7 billion worth of food, feed, and fiber at market value under the Mutual Security Act.

These sales generate hard currency markets, too. Witness Spain, now a really large buyer of soybean oil for dollars.

Donations of emergency relief supplies are made to help friends abroad when disaster strikes. In the fiscal year 1960 food was provided for victims of natural disasters in 11 countries. For example, we fed refugees in Hong Kong and the Middle East. We helped twphoon victims in the Ryukyu Islands and Japan, and earthquake victims in Chile and Morocco. We supplied food for charitable institutions and school lunch programs.

The U.S. Government also works voluntary organizations in developing people-to-people food donation programs. These include such agencies as CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Also participating are the international organizations UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Administration) and UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund). Seventy-five million American people support this program through their gifts, their work, and their membership in the voluntary agencies.

In the meantime, other free world nations are rendering vital aid to foreign people in distress. Some of this aid is extended on a country-to-country basis, some through and in consultation with international organizations.

In the latter category is the Wheat Utilization Committee, on which are represented the major wheat-exporting countries—Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, and the United States. This Committee, with the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization as an adviser-observer, is investigating the possibility of increasing and making more effective coordinated use of wheat to promote economic development, improve nutritional standards, and expand world commercial trade in wheat.

With the food-for-peace program we are associating the need for food abroad with our tremendous agricultural technological capability.

In terms of feeding hungry people, results have been highly gratifying.

1. Nutritional levels in the underdeveloped parts of the world have gone up.

2. Agriculture generally has kept abreast of or ahead of population increase in the underdeveloped areas.

But we must keep in mind that even with the sharp advances in agricultural technology, its growth must continue at an increasing rate because of the tremendous increase expected in population in the years ahead and the growing pressures to raise living standards.

The food-for-peace program is promoting economic growth in the newly developing countries. This, too, eventually will mean enlarged, permanent markets. Economic development stimulates sales. Many countries, graduated from sales for foreign currencies to sales for dollars after their war-disrupted economies had been rebuilt.

Today Public Law 480 foreign currencies are contributing to economic development in Asia, the Middle East, southern Europe, and Latin America. Here are a few samples:

India: Power projects, irrigation facilities, schools.

Indonesia: Rehabilitation of railways, highways, harbors, airports.

Israel: Agricultural development, electric power facilities, transportation.

Greece: Roads and bridges, electric power, agricultural development, vocational education.

Brazil: Grain elevators, transportation, electric power.

Economic development, in addition to creating permanent markets is furthering the general foreign policy aims of the United States and the free world. One of the keystones of foreign policy is a strong free world—strong enough to stand against aggression and subversion. Increased economic well-being will go far in achieving that strength.

Following negotiation of the United States-Indian wheat-rice agreement, which was signed on March 4, 1960, the Indian Express editorialized, "The Eisenhower-Patil food agreement stands out as an act of good faith in human relations. It is of high material value enhanced by the terms and the timing. It is of far greater import in terms of the spirit of faith in human ideals and in the striving to retain them."

The image that the United States is building among the hungry peoples of the world is tangible. It cannot be blotted out with propaganda. By using food as a major instrument of foreign policy we are doing what the Communists would like to do but can't.

In the rivalry between East and West, agriculture is one area of many in which we have clearly and without question demonstrated superiority. The food-for-peace program is expanding the opportunity to make that agricultural superiority felt.

The food-for-peace program is not without its hazards.

1. We must not hurt the economies of other agricultural exporting countries by usurping their markets.

2. We must beware of making the developing countries dependent upon us, indefinitely, with their growing populations, for our continuing help.

3. We must avoid flooding the recipient countries with our food, depressing their farm prices and hurting their agriculture.

4. We must not give away, barter, or sell for foreign currency, food, and fiber, that we could otherwise sell for dollars.

However, just because there are hazards, we cannot forego the use of our capability in the agricultural field. We must not bury our talent.

Accomplishments of the program have been demonstrated; the hazards have been avoided in the past. We are confident they will be in the future.

At the same time, overall performance can be improved. Part of this can come from greater understanding of the program's objectives and accomplishments. Above all, better performance will come if all concerned are alert, not only for problems, but for opportunities. Is it not good sense—yes, good business—for you as hard-headed businessmen to study and suggest means of implementing similar programs in your countries? Can we businessmen accept the challenge and make proposals to our Government and other groups to expand food consumption among the less fortunate? Mankind is your business. In the largest sense you are your brother's keeper.

Arnold Toynbee has said: "Our age will be well remembered, not for its horrifying crimes nor its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

I am neither a politician nor a scientist, but my guess is that the next major war is the last war for us.

Aren't we our brother's keeper?

TRUST STATUS OF CERTAIN LANDS ON THE CROW CREEK INDIAN RESERVATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

my taste for Atkinson's Doncaster Toffee. It has a sucrose, glucose, dextrose quality, like warm spun sugar twining itself around the aorta. Hassan, its protagonist, through a chance encounter with the Caliph Haroun-al-Rachid, is removed from the humble but cozy purlieus of his shop to the world of affairs of state. At first the transposition pleases him. "For all these years I have been a humble man, of soft and kindly disposition—such a man as the world and a woman hate," says he. "But now I shall never again be the fool of my fellows." Afterward, though, failing to soften the Caliph's line on capital punishment, he is glad to retire, and withdraws from public life as a pilgrim, marching off stage singing, in chorus with the rest of the caravan, "We take the Golden Road to Samarkand."

For Hassan's sake, I was predisposed in favor of Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., founder of the John Birch Society and author of its Koran, "The Blue Book" (copyright Robert Welch, 1959). Mr. Welch had an early life much like that of my older friend. He was, before he became an author, a candymaker in Cambridge, Mass. The only other American public man I can think of with an equally mellifluent background is Adolf A. Berle, Jr., who was chairman of the board of the America Molasses Co. But whereas Hassan, squatting among his sugar kettles, used to write poetry, Mr. Welch, by his own account, read world history. And while the peppermint popped and the popsicles purred, he became so impressed by the analogies he discovered in his reading that, like Mohammed, he heard a voice saying to him, "Recite." Accordingly, he summoned a number of disciples to meet him at a hotel in Indianapolis, where there are always rooms (except during auto-race week), on December 8, 1958. "The Blue Book" is, its author explains, a record of what he said at the ensuing meeting, as fraught with consequences as a chocolate bar with peanuts. Only 11 disciples attended, leaving him one short of the conventional complement, but they represented 8 States.

It is inspiring to think of that seminal meeting, in a hotel banquet suite, perhaps named for one of the characters of James Whitcomb Riley, the Hoosier laureate—the Little Orphan Annie Room. The Wise Men from afar sit one knee over the other around the manger of the new truth, and Mr. Welch tells them:

"The Gobble-uns'll git you ef you don't watch out."

"With short breaks for coffee, for luncheons, and for brief discussions in between sections of the presentation, it required 2 whole days to set forth the background, methods, and purposes of the John Birch Society. The pages that follow are simply a transcript practically verbatim, of that presentation," Mr. Welch reports. "I personally have been studying the problem (of communism) increasingly for about 9 years," he told the original 11, "and practically full time for the past 3 years. And entirely without pride, but in simple thankfulness, let me point out that a lifetime of business experience should have made it easier for me to see the falsity of the economic theories on which communism is supposedly based, more readily, than might some scholar coming into that study from the academic cloisters; while a lifetime of interest in things academic, especially world history, should have given me an advantage over many businessmen in more rapidly seeing the sophistries in dialectric materialism."

His world history is Neo-Spenglerian, although, he concedes, "there is certainly more Welch than there is Spengler" in it, and he has contributed not a few new details. It was Darius and not Cyrus who, according to Mr. Welch, overthrew the "Neo-Babylonian civilization;" Greek colonists conquered Italy, founded Rome, and "developed Roman civilization;" and the Roman Empire of the West "started dying from the cancer of collectivism from the time Diocletian imposed on it his New Deal."

The notion of conventional historians like Rostovtzeff and Burckhardt has been that the Roman economy hit the skids a century and a half earlier, and that Diocletian, poor man, was merely trying to pick up the pieces. One of his measures was a system of price controls, and this probably has caused Mr. Welch to confuse him with Franklin D. Roosevelt. The theory that Greece conquered Rome has not yet become dogma, either, but it may; it is in line with the discovery that the South won the Civil War after Sherman's Flight to the Sea.

"Basically, when you dig through the chaff and the dressing in Spengler enough to get at his thought, he held that a societal development which we ordinarily class as a civilization is an organic culture, which goes through a life cycle just the same as any of the individual organisms which we see whole and with which we are more familiar." Western Europe reached its high point in the second half of the 19th century, Mr. Welch holds, and is now dying of a "collectivist cancer" that has invaded us. We must excise it—a herculean task. His prose abounds in figures of speech based on cancer and cardiac afflictions, which should be impressive to a public of predominantly elderly executives. (Welch himself is 61.)

Theories, however, are less his concern than facts—his eye deciphers surface appearances as easily as it does the creme fondant within the walnut imperial. For example, he says of one nation not commonly detected: "And gentlemen, any idea that Norway is not, for all practical purposes, now in Communist hands * * * is in my opinion as unrealistic as the thought that Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana is a Democrat." (The Norwegian Storting, or Parliament, has one Communist among its 150 members.)

"Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco" are places where the Communists "either already have control, however disguised, or are rapidly acquiring control." Nehru, Nasser, and Sukarno are Communists, like General Eisenhower.

"The Communists are now in complete control of Bolivia and Venezuela." The only Latin-American governments Welch endorsed in 1958 were Paraguay, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Batista's Cuba, all dictatorships. Batista has now, of course, gone down the drain—an incalculable loss to Western civilization. Hawaii, Mr. Welch revealed, was Communist through and through. Since its admission as a State, the poison has, presumably, reached our vitals.

"The whole slogan of civil rights, as used to make trouble in the South today, is an exact parallel to the slogan of agrarian reform which they (you are expected to know by this time who "they" always are) used in China." Discovering the points at which the John Birch line makes fast to those of other kindred revelations is a continual beguilement as the reader of "The Blue Book" goes along. Here it hitches with the White Supremacists. A bit farther on, declaring the Algerian war a Communist creation, it ties on to the colons.

Our troubles, however, are of our own making. "The first great break for the Communist conspiracy came in 1933, with our formal recognition of Stalin's regime. At that time the Russian government was staying alive financially from week to week by methods which, in the case of individuals, would be called check-kiting." (At the moment, as I recall, we were pretty broke ourselves. The banks stayed closed until Roosevelt got them open again, and Al Smith and the Daily News advocated recognition of the U.S.S.R. as a method of reviving us.) "Our recognition tremendously increased their prestige and credit, at home and with other nations. It saved them from financial collapse." What good it would do the Russian government, if broke, to increase its credit at home, in Russia, where nobody had any money, is one of "The Blue Book's" minor enigmas.

In Asia, where we are also out of luck, our Government prevented Chiang Kai-shek's troops from getting even ammunition, while the Russians gave the Reds tremendous stockpiles of Japanese arms. (The primary cause of the defeat of the Chinese Nationalist Army was the military aggressiveness of the Chinese Communist forces, and sound tactics, which were based on the capabilities and limitations of the Red military. Communist victory was achieved without the extensive use of modern-, large-caliber weapons, motor transport or aircraft, but by sound, aggressive tactics on the ground.—Lt. Col. Robert B. Rigg, a U.S. military observer, in Red China's Fighting Hordes.)

The chief weapon of the Communists in thus maggoting the world outside our borders has been treachery, not science. They have never, for example, built an atomic bomb: Their agents had simply walked off from our plants with the necessary separate parts, which had then been assembled in Russia, and exploded whenever it best suited the Soviets' pretenses. In the light of this fact, all the pother about disarmament conferences is superfluous. All we have to do to disarm the Russians is to install a proper security system in our own plants. (When they walked off with the parts of our heavy-rocket booster, they might at least have left us the plans.)

And now that they are working up on us—they've got Hawaii already, remember, with two Red Senators on Capitol Hill—they have three possible courses. One would be, through a sufficient amount of infiltration and propaganda, to disguise communism as just another political party. When I reached this point, I peeked ahead to see which party was to be the Trojan donkey. But Mr. Welch had written, "We do not anticipate that development." Another route to the consummation of conquest would be by fomenting internal civil war in this country, and aiding the Communist side in that war with all necessary military might, as an outside power may do in say, Cuba. But he didn't anticipate that, either, although he said, "One never could tell."

The third method, "which is far more in accordance with Lenin's long-range strategy," is the "one which they are clearly relying on most heavily." This, on which they are already launched with gratifyingly fearful results, is to take over the Government by a process so gradual and insidious that they will have us in the bag before we know it. One step is to lure us deeper and deeper into the United Nations, which is a thinly disguised branch of the Soviet Government itself, "until one day we shall gradually realize that we are already just a part of a worldwide government ruled by the Kremlin, with the police-state features of that government rapidly closing in on ourselves. But another part of the plan is the conversion of the United States into a socialist nation, quite similar to Russia itself in its economy and political outlook. The best way to explain the aim here is simply to quote the directive under which some of the very largest American foundations have secretly but visibly been working for years. This directive is so to change the economic and political structure of the United States that it can be comfortably merged with Soviet Russia."

Here Mr. Welch, like Mohammed in most of the Koran, omits the source of his quotation. In the prophet's case, it is always understood to be God. At this point, with Asia gone under altogether, Europe gone under (all but Spain and Portugal), South

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

America gone under (all but Paraguay), Africa gone under (all but the Union), us going (all but Arizona), the reader might well expect, as I did, a call to a preventive war, or at least the setting up of a force, entirely commanded by admirals called back from retirement, that would put the skulking devils in their place. This could be done in three steps. One, we stop them from snitching any more bomb parts. Two, we blockade them and starve them out. Three, we send them only stale surplus chocolate bars to eat until they say "uncle" ("dyadya"). I can imagine the 11 disciples squirming on their hotel chairs in the Claypool, hardly able to hold themselves down as they awaited the slogan cry "Out cutlasses and board."

But, Welch warns, this is the trap they planned for us. "Although our danger remains almost entirely internal, from Communist influences right in our midst and treason right in our Government, the American people are being persuaded that our danger is from the outside, is from Russian military superiority." What we have to do, then, is not spend money on defense, not pay taxes, but balance the budget at zero, stultify central government, defend States rights, stop Federal aid to education (it leads to thought control), pay no attention to talk about the horrors of war, since we won't have any arms anyway, and, above all, derecognize Russia and it will blow away. To make the juju stronger, we are to abandon foreign aid, abolish the income tax, and "win that battle, against communism, presumably, by alertness, by determination, by courage, by an energizing realization of the danger, if we can; but let's win it, even with our lives, if the time comes when we must." (Without spending money.) It sounds like a program for eating your jelly beans and having them, or ruling the skies with obsolete airplanes. It also sounds like the program of turning a back on the world devised for 17-century Japan by the Tokugawa Shogun Iyemitsu. "Don't look and it will go away" was the Tokugawa's prescription, but the outside world didn't, and when Japan looked again, centuries later, she found herself in a most humiliating position. (In the interim, 80 percent of her people had lived in fairly continuous hunger, which forced them to the regular practice of infanticide to keep the population down.) The Birch creed should, I would think, tickle the pants off any Russian official in his right mind, for its essence is unilateral disarmament through permitted obsolescence, a breakup of Federal authority, and a withdrawal from the international field.

One of the entrancing episodes of the John Birch epopee, for me, was the behavior of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, supposedly a fire-eater, who had John Birch tracts, which are essentially pacifist, passed out to his men. I wondered whether he had read them. The obession of ubiquitous treachery, moreover, is exactly what will make a soldier soonest take off. A division convinced of the prevalence of treason all the way back to base will scatter at the first shot.

When the modern Hassan reaches the chapter of his revelation in which he discusses positive measures against the "world-wide Communist conspiracy" ("And so, let's act"), he is less impressive than when he is evoking the dangers that hedge us around. As an initial move toward breaking Marx's back, he would establish reading rooms, "somewhat similar to the Christian Science reading rooms," where the writings of Robert Welch would be available. The society's publications "should be put in barbershops, from which we obtained firm written promises to welcome these publications and keep them on the reading tables." Members of the society should listen to the broadcasts of Fulton Lewis, Jr. And everybody should write letters for worthy causes like withdrawal of recognition from Russia and the repeal of the income tax. Above all, there should be "exposure" of Communists, by publication.

"Let's make what we are talking about clearer by an illustration. There is the head of one of the great educational institutions in the East (not Harvard, incidentally) whom at least some of us believe to be a Communist. Even with a hundred thousand dollars to hire sleuths to keep him and his present contacts under constant surveillance for a while, and to retrace every detail of his past history, I doubt if we could prove it on him. But—with just $5,000 to pay for the proper amount of careful research I believe we could get all the material needed for quite a shock. We would run in the magazine an article consisting entirely of questions to this man, which would be devastating in their implications. The question technique, when skillfully used in this way, is mean and dirty. But the Communists we are after are meaner and dirtier, and too slippery for you to put your fingers on in the ordinary way—no matter how much they look and act like prosperous members of the local Rotary Club."

The disproportion between the magnitude of the evil discovered everywhere and the insignificance of the remedies proposed makes Birchism a demoniac religion. The Birchist, like man before the invention of fire, wanders helpless among malignant forces, his only consolation inner knowledge of how terrible things are, his only protection an amulet in the form of a "blue book," his only weapon a postage stamp. His chiefest satisfaction is his conviction that his neighbor will perish, and that he will probably deserve to. "Communist" for the Birchist, the reader gathers after the first page or so of the book, means anybody who approves of paying taxes, national defense, public education, civil rights, the United Nations, labor unions, or poetry since Tennyson. There is no politician in whom Welch sees hope; even BARRY GOLDWATER is a soft-hearted sap. And so it is true, for him, that there are "Communists" everywhere. Socialists, in the penumbra of the weird world Welch inhabits, are Communists; Roosevelt and, save the mark, Woodrow Wilson strengthened central government, so were Socialists, so Communists. It is an ugly doctrine, which inhibits every effort to outperform our rivals, because implicit in it is the assurance that the effort will end in betrayal. Taken seriously, it could be more destructive than the nerve gas that all up-to-date chemical-warfare branches are now supposed to possess, which paralyzes the will to resist. Only this gas, instead of being carried over borders by ICB missiles, is a native product, for home consumption, like coconut bars.

THE FOLLY OF DESPAIR

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a column which appears in this morning's Washington Post, from the pen of our distinguished political pundit, Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Folly of Despair." In the article Mr. Lippmann attempts to recast the troubled times of the moment in the context and perspective of recent history, instead of in the narrower confines of the setbacks and discouragements which arise occasionally from day to day.

Because of the insight it provides and the reconstitution of faith in our position in the world which it espouses, I am sure Members of the Senate have read the article with great interest, as I have; and I believe that we ought to share it with those who may see it only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOLLY OF DESPAIR

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have had a run of bad news and the time has come when we must make up our minds whether to face it and learn from it, or to shrink from it into a nervous breakdown with suicidal tendencies. There are altogether too many of us who in dismay and disappointment are ready to admit that Khrushchev is right in predicting that communism is sweeping the world and that, short of war, we have no means of stopping it.

They are like the man who, as an experienced diplomat once put it many years ago, is so worried that he will fall off the top floor of the Empire State Building that he stops the elevator and jumps out of the ninth floor window. I believe this defeatism to be profoundly mistaken and unwarranted. It is based on a misreading and a misunderstanding of what has happened since the Second World War and what is happening now. The root of the error is to equate, instead of to differentiate between, the communistic movement which owes allegiance to Moscow and Peiping and the worldwide movements of social reform and social revolution, which almost everywhere seek national independence and nonalinement with the great powers.

Mr. Khrushchev's hope and belief is that he will lead and direct all the reforming and revolutionary movements. We play right into his hands when we identify ourselves with the opponents of change rather than with the leaders of change.

For those who think that Laos and southeast Asia are gone and that like the dominoes all the Asian nations and the Pacific will go too, I should like to call attention to Egypt. It was not so many years ago—in fact it was in 1955—when we were told that Egypt and Syria and Iraq, and all the oil of the Persian Gulf, and the Suez Canal, were gone or going. Egypt had gotten arms from Czechoslovakia, it got Soviet help in building the Aswan Dam, it nationalized the Suez Canal, and all was lost.

Yet look at it now. Syria and Iraq and the Persian Gulf states are not Communist. Egypt continues to put its Communists in jail. Mr. Khrushchev has attacked Egypt publicly. President Nasser is calling a congress of the neutrals who do not take their direction from Moscow. Egypt has played a decisive part in preventing the flow of Soviet arms to the rebels in the Congo.

After Egypt and the Middle East, look at Africa, look at Guinea, which 6 months ago was written off as gone. It is not gone despite the several hundred Soviet technicians who are there. Probably it is not gone in part at least because the Soviet technicians who are there have made themselves so unpopular. In any event the chances are good that Guinea in the end will line up with the rest of independent Africa as a neutral state.

There is now a great likelihood that the whole of North Africa, all the way from Morocco to Egypt, will take a neutral line, refusing to be dominated by Moscow or to take direction from Paris or Washington.

Moreover, I do not believe that Cuba is gone, and I have a very strong impression that Mr. Khrushchev does not begin to think Cuba is as gone as, let us say, Senator SMATHERS thinks it is. For Cuba is as far from Moscow as Laos is from Washington. In time, not necessarily in a very long time,

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

dustrial know-how to give us the material strength necessary to defend our country and the free world. Each must ask himself what he can contribute to help make this Nation strong, secure, and victorious.

This brings me to the question of where we stand today. What kind of forces do we have to defend us in this continuing struggle? The answer is clear, We have forces and equipment designed to deter war and to insure peace in the world. We have devoted, skilled, and purposeful people in our Armed Forces, whose first thought is the security of this country. And we have the hardware and the equipment to enable our people to do the job of protecting the peace.

Let me briefly review for you our military position. The Department of Defense along with other agencies of the Government has the responsibility for opposing Communist efforts at expansion. All the military services, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are trained, equipped, and organized to meet any threat to the security of our country or to that of our allies with whom we are joined in collective security agreements.

Our national policy is to deter the outbreak of general war. However, should deterrence fail, we must be able to win any war thrust upon us. For this purpose, we need an Air Force big enough, powerful enough and so deployed that it, together with the forces of the Army and the Navy can defeat any aggressor who might attack us. In addition, this force must be able to survive even a massive nuclear attack in sufficient strength to strike a decisive counterblow.

It is also most important to let potential aggressors know that we have such a ready force and that we will use it if necessary.

We do have that kind of force. It is a force in being capable of instant response at any moment. We have B–52 bombers that can reach anywhere in the world in a matter of hours. They can carry conventional and nuclear weapons and air-launched missiles. We also have B–47 bombers which can reach any assigned target with refueling. And we have the aerial refueling tankers that give our bombers their long-range capability. Finally, we have an increasing number of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) for strength and versatility in our armament.

Our ICBM inventory includes the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman. The Atlas liquid-fueled missile is already operational and in position on three of our Strategic Air Command bases—Vandenberg AFB, Calif., Warren AFB, Wyo., and Offutt AFB, Nebr. The Atlas has an accurate range of 5,500 nautical miles and travels at a speed of over 15,000 miles an hour.

The Titan is another liquid fueled missile now being tested. It promises to be highly successful, and SAC Titan crews are already in training to take over the missiles as soon as they become operational. Titan will be launched from underground protected sites. In a recent test, a Titan was launched from a 146-foot-deep pit. It passed this test with flying colors.

The Minuteman ballistic missile is lighter, smaller, simpler and less expensive than the two preceding missiles. It is a three-stage solid propellent missile which will be stored in widely dispersed underground hardened sites, or silos, ready for firing on short notice.

We also have Thor and Jupiter intermediate range missiles which have a range of about 1,500 miles and are highly accurate. The first Thor missiles were delivered to England in the fall of 1958 and turned over to the British Royal Air Force. The Jupiter missiles have been delivered to the Italian and Turkish Air Forces.

You may have seen the name Thor in connection with our nonmilitary space research. Thor has been a workhorse as the booster propulsion system for much of this research, including the lunar probe, the Discoverer launches, and the Explorer satellites. You all know the great contribution made by Redstone produced at Huntsville, Ala., through the years and that it was the booster in Commander Shepard's epic flight.

We also have air-launched missiles to give further strength to our manned bombers. In this category, we have Hound Dog and Skybolt. Hound Dog is an air-to-ground guided missile powered by a large jet engine. It can be carried beneath the wing of a B–52 bomber, thus making it unnecessary for the bomber to penetrate enemy defenses since Hound Dog can be launched against targets 500 miles away.

The Skybolt is an advanced air-launched ballistic missile with a range of about 1,000 miles. It can be carried by a B–52 and launched from points beyond the defense capability of an enemy. It thus degrades the enemy defenses and enables our B–52 bombers to remain out of range of enemy defenses while launching the Skybolt against them.

Incidentally, as I mention the manned bomber, you might wonder why we need manned aircraft when missiles are available. The Air Force doesn't foresee any end to the need for manned bombers in the immediate future. We can achieve the best operational effectiveness by combining manned and unmanned systems. We thereby acquire greater flexibility and compound the problems of the enemy.

We can put manned aircraft on airborne alert, we can direct them to search out new targets, and most significant, we can call them back.

Another vital part of our ability to deter war is in the response time of our alert forces. Many Strategic Air Command bomber crews are constantly on the alert and are so well trained that within 3 minutes of an alarm both bombers and refueling tankers can be rolling down the runway.

To further strengthen our deterrent policy, we must be sure that our SAC alert forces could survive a surprise ballistic missile attack. We can do this by keeping part of the force airborne at all times. We are now training our SAC forces for the airborne alert and are ready to put a significant portion of the B–52 bomber force on operational airborne alert any time the President directs.

So long as a potential aggressor knows that he cannot destroy all of our deterrent forces by surprise attack nor prevent them from striking back decisively he will be less likely to risk an attack against us. Thus, the airborne alert is another highly important element of our deterrent posture.

The Air Force also has forces ready to respond to small war situations, it provides troop and cargo airlift for all defense forces, and it makes a significant contribution to the aerospace defense of North America.

The other military services have their roles in assuring the security of our Nation.

The Army provides forces and equipment for continental defense through its Nike batteries. Army units, equipped with modern weapons systems serve overseas in positions close to the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, immediately ready for limited war.

The Navy stands ready to assure control of the seas. It has nuclear powered submarines equipped with the advanced Polaris weapon system. These craft are capable of remaining submerged for long periods and of launching their missiles without surfacing.

Navy striking forces and Marines are mobile and available for cold war and limited war situations. The Sixth Fleet is ready for action in the Mediterranean. The Seventh Fleet stands ready in the Far East. The First and Second Fleets are available to reinforce the others in the Pacific and Atlantic areas.

Thus, we have well rounded and carefully deployed military capability to protect ourselves and the free world and to maintain peace.

Our strength is no reason for smugness. We cannot rest upon our oars and hope to maintain our leadership. We must continue to press forward on all fronts on research, development, and production of weapon systems. At the same time, we must recall that the struggle now going on in the world is not wholly military. We must therefore keep our eyes on the larger goals of freedom, justice, and plenty for all the people of the world. This is the mission of democracy. With this belief in the freedom of man as the cornerstone of our efforts, I am sure we cannot fail.

The John Birch Society as a Church Leader Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Rev. George S. Stoddard, pastor of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in El Monte, Calif., has thoughtfully commented on the work of the John Birch Society. Reverend Stoddard's comments are reported in an article by Ray Bernard which was printed in the May 18, 1961, issue of the El Monte Herald newspaper. I wish to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WESLEYAN LEADER BACKS UP BIRCHERS

(By Ray Bernard)

"The Communist danger and the encroaching grip of communism on this country and all remaining free nations must be fought without regard for ethics, because an ethical approach is construed only as weakness by the Red regime," a local minister told the Herald yesterday.

The Reverend George S. Stoddard, pastor of the Wesleyan Methodist Church and chaplain of the American Legion Post 261, of El Monte, offered a rebuttal of remarks critical of the John Birch Society made recently by Rev. J. Max Chamberlin, pastor of the First Methodist Church, 629 North Tyler.

"So far our struggle against the Reds has been weak and spineless, and has been construed by them as weakness. They have gained by the cold war and by our unwillingness to meet them with their own weapons," said Reverend Stoddard.

The clergyman said he felt that comment by Reverend Chamberlin on the San Francisco riots was a mere slap on the wrist and a glossing over of a serious and dangerous event.

A veteran of World War I, he was in the 27th Division and served in France around Verdun. He entered Casanova University in New York shortly after discharge to begin studies for the ministry. He finished studies in 1924, entered the ministry that fall, and took up his first pastorate at Delmar, a small town in Pennsylvania, on which he looks back as his happiest year.

At that time Reverend Stoddard belonged to Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1926 he entered the Christian Missionary Alliance and served 6 years as a missionary in Africa, in what is now the Republic of Guinea.

He has been with the Wesleyan Methodist Church about 21 years.

Reverend Stoddard holds that the John Birch Society, to which he does not belong, is

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

he received an appointment to West Point in 1917.

Twining graduated from the advanced flying school at Kelly Field, Tex., in 1924, and has been associated with aviation ever since, first in the Army Air Corps and then in the Air Force.

During World War II General Twining had tactical command of all forces in the South Pacific, then commanded the 15th Air Force in strategic bombardment from bases in Italy until the end of the war in Europe. He then commanded the 20th Air Force operating from the Marianas Islands against Japan until the close of the war in the Pacific.

He became Air Force Chief of Staff in 1953, and assumed the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top military post, on August 15, 1957.

General Twining retired from active duty September 30, 1960, ending 44 years of military service.

His Armed Forces Day speech follows:

ARMED FORCES DAY ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

Congressman BOYKIN, General Callahan, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you Mr. BOYKIN for your kind words of introduction. It is a distinct pleasure for me to be here in Mobile because all my memories of your city are happy ones. And also the many years of association with Congressman BOYKIN have been most helpful to me personally in my job as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is truly a great American—always alert to the needs of his country.

As a retired Air Force officer, I have occasion to think of Mobile as the location of one of our outstanding Air Force bases. Brookley Air Force Base is not a fine air materiel depot by chance or accident. The people of Mobile who work there and those who have made our Air Force personnel welcome to your city have contributed greatly to the reputation and the efficiency of this depot. We are proud of it and I think the citizens of Mobile should be proud of what they have done to make it what it is. The Air Force people have always been made to feel at home, and they appreciate that I can assure you.

The invitation to speak here on Armed Forces Day is a great honor to me.

And first I would like to go behind the scenes a little and explore the reasons for our observance of this day in this particular way.

There is no question that the American people are peace loving and have no aggressive designs against anyone else. Indeed our history proves that it takes extreme provocation to make us take up arms. So, we may ask why such a peaceful country as ours celebrates Armed Forces Day.

We do not have to seek far for the answer to this question. A review of recent history explains why we honor the military services of our country. Since the beginning of this century, the United States has been involved in two major wars—World War I and World War II—as well as the Korean war. We went into these conflicts not to profit ourselves or to gain territory from anyone but to protect and defend freedom in the world. It was through the skill, strength, and devotion of our Armed Forces that we were able to succeed. Consequently, since 1950 we have honored the military services for their role in upholding our way of life by observing Armed Forces Day throughout our land.

So you see, this is a far from warlike celebration. On the contrary, it is an occasion to honor the forces which make it possible for us to be at peace.

During the last decade, another force has arisen in the world. This force is aggressive, provocative and dedicated to a single end—the domination of the world. This fact has brought into our Armed Forces Day celebrations another meaning. We now must keep our people aware of this danger to them. We must remind ourselves annually that it is only through our strong military power backed up by our industrial strength that we do have power for peace.

Thus, Armed Forces Day continues to be observed throughout the Nation in a double sense. We look back to the successes of our Armed Forces and honor them for helping us preserve our way of life. We also look at the present and future need for Armed Forces to assure the continuance of our way of life.

It is therefore, most appropriate for us to assemble here to reaffirm our determination not to permit any aggressive totalitarian force to overcome us. At the same time, it is also important to remind ourselves of the urgent necessity of maintaining our strength for this purpose.

What I would like to do today is talk to you as a military man about this threat to our security, our responsibilities as a result of it, and what we have in the Armed Forces to assure us that the threat will never be any more than a threat.

First of all, I think it is correct to say that today we are faced by the most serious challenge to our way of life that has ever been directed at us.

The seriousness of this threat rests in its all inclusive nature. I think most Americans recognize that communism is a menace to us. But I am not yet convinced that all Americans realize how grave this menace is nor how thorough its plans are to achieve its objective.

If we were faced only with a military force we could surely develop our own might to counter it. But communism embraces all aspects of life. It is an economic, political, psychological, ideological, and moral as well as a military threat to us. Further, it is one that operates continuously without rest or surcease from its efforts. Each propaganda statement is part of a long range plan for taking over all the nations of the world.

Each scientific achievement fits into this plan. Every space shot plays a role in the continuing campaign to draw into the Communist sphere of influence the uncommitted or wavering nations of the world. Each maneuver in the cold war is another bit of pressure upon us. Each trade agreement or economic treaty is one of the steps in the drive to push us back into our own continent and to isolate us from our allies and outer resources.

The free nations of the world have never faced such a highly organized opponent with such single-minded devotion to one objective. Our tendency is to react as free people and to deal with each situation as it arises. We can no longer afford to do this for no single situation that we encounter today is isolated from the others. They are all joined in this overall, long-range plan of world domination.

The immediacy of the threat has been brought home to us by recent events. I refer, of course, to Cuba. Here we have a state only 90 miles from our Florida coast which our State Department has characterized as a full-fledged member of the Communist bloc. This puts your own city of Mobile within a few minutes striking distance of intermediate range ballistic missiles or even of the tactical missile. And it is not out of range of land-based aircraft.

The possibility of a military threat of Communist forces in nearby Cuba is not the only thing we must be concerned about. The fact that communism has a base of operations in the New World from which it may spread out into Central and South American countries is of great concern to your officials in Washington. And every American should view this phenomenon with equal seriousness.

If we have any question of the intentions of world communism, we can easily find out what they are. On January 6, 1961, Mr. Khrushchev delivered a long address summing up the results of a meeting of 81 worldwide Communist Party organizations that had just met in Moscow. He laid out the guidelines for the world campaign of the Communist movement in this remarkable speech. The plan is there just as clearly as was Hitler's program in his book, "Mein Kampf." We but have to read and know what faces us. We paid little attention to "Mein Kampf" and I am afraid are paying less to Khrushchev's speech.

As President Kennedy has said:

"We face a relentless struggle in every corner of the globe that goes far beyond the clash of armies or even nuclear armaments.

"The armies are there and in large numbers. The nuclear armaments are there. But they serve primarily as the shield behind which subversion, infiltration and a host of other tactics steadily advance picking off vulnerable areas, one by one, in situations which do not permit our own armed intervention."

The President also pointed out that: "We will have to face the fact that we cannot postpone any longer the real issue of survival of freedom in this Hemisphere itself. On that issue, unlike perhaps some others, there can be no middle ground" (address to American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 20, 1961).

That puts the problem squarely before us and poses the issue for us. It is up to us to do something about it. It is true we are faced by a hard struggle and in certain respects the Communists have outpaced us. I am thinking particularly of their successes in launching heavy vehicles into space. Such successes are certainly material for worldwide propaganda efforts. They may make it seem to some nations that the democracies are hopelessly outclassed. But we know that this is not true. Our space effort is coming along very well. We all took immense pride in Commander Shephard's great recent performance. And this was done before the eyes and the ears of the world—the truly democratic way. We have put a very large number of devices into orbit. They have returned scientific information of untold value to ourselves and to the world. In this respect we are certainly ahead. And it must be remembered that all our achievements have not deprived the civilian economy of a single thing. While it may be unfortunate that we have not launched massive vehicles into a space orbit yet, we now can look forward to this achievement within a reasonable time.

As far as our defense needs are concerned, we have military missiles with all the necessary power to reach any target on earth which we want to reach. That is all a weapon system has to do.

I firmly believe that the fate of our democratic system of government rests in the hands of its citizens. This means that it is up to you and me to see to it that our nation has the proper determination, the correct moral atmosphere and the willingness to sacrifice whatever we must to enable us to overcome all obstacles to our survival.

Now—people living under totalitarian forms of government make sacrifices because their leaders force them to do so. We Americans must match and surpass the discipline of the dictator with the self-discipline of free peoples. We have done this in the past, and I am sure we can do it to any degree necessary in the future.

With this kind of determination, we certainly can use our ingenuity and our in-

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

forthright in exposing to public scrutiny in its Blue Book the exact reason for its existence—"namely to destroy the grip of communism in this country, using all methods short of rapine and murder employed by the men from Moscow. Fighting fire with fire is an old and effective method. Force by force is the only language they understand," he insisted.

"The Birch Society is willing to stand congressional investigation without employing the fifth amendment dodge. They welcome an opportunity to tell the country the unvarnished story of their origin, purpose and plan of action against communism."

The clergyman pointed out that Communists and Socialists alike invariably refuse to take the loyalty oath, and cloister behind the fifth amendment to avoid incrimination.

"You can be sure Communist influence on highly placed officials in government," he predicted, "will quash the investigation. Such an investigation would give the John Birch Society a million or more new members."

Waxing eloquent, the Methodist leader said the caliber of the Birch group is guarantee of its sanity and solid worth. "The membership is screened. No riffraff or career rabble rousers are admitted. The organization is made up of the finest conservative segment of American society.

"They have the will, the brains, and the means to implement a complete exposure of Communist infiltration of all segments of American society, and to do something drastic about it."

"It is common knowledge," the religious leader continued, "that all professions and crafts have been infiltrated to some degree—our colleges, teaching staffs, unions, factory personnel, segments of news media, government both state and national, and even the church, have fellow travelers strategically placed."

Yet, he pointed out, in recent talks the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of the Presbyterian General Assembly has vehemently denied any infiltration of the crafts, professions, and the church. 'He infers no Red threat exists, and with equal vehemence has attacked the John Birch Society as a dangerously conservative society to be closely watched. The public, now stirred and informed, repudiates both of these bromides, even though they are cloaked in the garb of a clergyman.

"The John Birch Society is best recommended by the type of organizations and people who oppose it: the Communists, certain news media, some dissidents and pseudointellectuals. Such have helped the Commies greatly in their crusade to discredit the organization."

The minister went on to point out what he considers proof of such aid. "The San Francisco youth riots, the attacks on the validity of the film 'Operation Abolition,' the screaming insults against the integrity of the patriotic 'Young America for Freedom Society,' and the John Birch Society, the smokescreen of words 'negative, absurd, superconservative,' stems from people of similar social, political, and governmental philosophy—namely, socialism."

Socialism and democracy, Rev. Stoddard said, are at opposite poles and differ as darkness and light. "Democracy has given us substance, and socialism would give us theory, promises, pie in the sky, and in the end, enslavement. Communism is socialism without a conscience, gone berserk. There is no 'middle-of-the-road,' no compromise between democracy and communism. Every American is either right or left, conservative or socialist.

"Anyone who doubts this should consider the bloody streets of Budapest, the slaughter pits of Poland, the prisons of Russia and her satellites, the concentration camps of Siberia, the communes of Red China, or visit the new Cuba of the 'golden age.'

Mr. Stoddard said he felt that while the "Operation" film was graphic and shocking, it does indicate the diabolical design of communism.

Remarks of the Commanding General of Fort Sill, Okla., on Armed Forces Day, May 20, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Maj. Gen. L. S. Griffing, commanding general of Fort Sill, Okla., on Armed Forces Day, May 20, 1961:

COMMANDING GENERAL'S REMARKS, ARMED FORCES DAY, MAY 20, 1961

One day not long ago, the President of the United States signed a proclamation which began with several indisputable "whereas's."

"Whereas," the document stated, "Whereas the survival of our cherished freedoms is dependent in large measure upon the capabilities of our Armed Forces * * *.

"Whereas the Armed Forces serve as a unified team in pursuit of a durable peace; and * * *.

"Whereas the strength of our Armed Forces rests (in major part) upon the understanding and support of an informed American people * * *.

"I hereby proclaim the third Saturday of May in 1961 as Armed Forces Day."

Today, on this third Saturday in May, upward of 25 million Americans are expected to visit nearby military installations in response to the President's proclamation.

Armed Forces Day was first established in 1950 as a single annual occasion to replace the different dates each year celebrated by the individual services. It was intended to symbolize the interdependence of all components of the Armed Forces and to afford a yearly opportunity to show the American people how their defense dollars are being spent.

Or to state it another way, Armed Forces Day provides the services an opportunity to give an annual accounting to the people of the United States.

Today, and this past week, the American people are being made aware of how well the Army—and the other Armed Forces—are prepared for the pursuit of peace.

Why do we have Armed Forces?

Stated briefly, we need Armed Forces to achieve our national objective. The United States represents the ultimate advance made by man throughout his history to achieve freedom. Our main national objective is to protect our national heritage and these freedoms which we uniquely enjoy.

A strong defense posture is the best insurance for peace because, as the President has pointed out, only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain that they will never be employed.

General Washington, nearly 150 years ago, put it this way: "If we desire peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

In other words, weakness, lack of preparedness, invite aggression.

That is why the theme of Armed Forces Day is "Power for Peace."

Before we can assess our preparedness, we must assess the threat. The threat to the peace of the world and our freedom today is international communism and its unswerving aim of world domination. All of us know that this threat is massive, global, and versatile.

Admittedly, the Communists loudly proclaim their desire for peace and disarmament—until it comes time for agreement on concrete, workable arrangements.

The conclusions which must be drawn from their actions are very different from the impressions they try to give with their propaganda. Those actions have consistently proved that the Communists' ultimate objective is world domination, and nothing less.

This is clear from their record all the way back to 1917. In the past 20 years alone, we have seen them attempt to dominate and extend their control—by force, when necessary—over Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Manchuria, and North Korea.

We have also seen the effort to annex Azerbaijan, the attack on Greece, the corruption of China, the rape of Korea, the communization of North Vietnam, efforts to penetrate the Middle East and Africa, and the annexation of Tibet.

Communist pressure continues today in Cuba and in Laos.

To achieve their objective of world domination, the Communists are maintaining massive military strength. This strength gives them the capability to conduct military operations in any of the varying intensities from all-out nuclear war to the so-called "limited war."

Further, the existence of these capabilities is a major factor in the psychological pressures of the cold war.

In the face of this threat and its numerous capabilities, our objective is to achieve peace with justice throughout the world.

What do we have to counter this threat?

We have the triservice defense team.

As a dedicated part of this team, the Army gives its full support to the basic defense policies outlined by President Kennedy in his recent defense budget message. You may recall that the President said: "The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war—to make certain that they will never have to be used—to deter all wars, general or limited, nuclear or conventional, large or small—to convince all potential aggressors that any attack would be futile—to provide backing for diplomatic settlement of disputes—to insure the adequacy of our bargaining power for an end to the arms race."

To understand the framework in which the modern army carries out its part of these basic national defense policies, it is first necessary to recall a primary precept of our overall national defense policy—that of collective security. Our existing international commitments in a large measure determine the utilization and deployment of the Army.

At home, to protect against a strategic threat, we have with our Canadian allies the North American Air Defense Command. Our on-site Nike-Hercules units play a significant role in this aspect of our home defenses.

We have built up a strategic striking force for instant retaliation in case of an all-out nuclear war. The Air Force and Navy have principal roles in this force. In this connec-

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

tion, I should like to say that we consider the deterrent retaliatory force represented by the Strategic Air Command to be absolutely vital to our survival. However, it is not appropriate for use in a limited war situation such as the Lebanon incident of 1959. It does guarantee freedom of action for limited war forces, and so long as we maintain superior strategic forces, limited conflict is likely to remain limited.

We must also have Army, Navy, and Air Forces equipped for limited as well as general war. Other forces which contribute to the Nation's deterrent to general and limited war, which are often overlooked, are our prepositioned Army, Navy and Air Forces in oversea areas.

With the aims of international communism clear and the emergence of Communist China as a major power, we have formed a system of global alliances with nations, who, like ourselves, desire freedom.

To fulfill our military commitments under the principle of collective security, and to meet other essential national requirements, we have Army units overseas in Germany, Italy, France, Korea, Okinawa, Panama, and in several other countries. Many of you here in this room have served in one of these oversea stations in the recent past.

When we tally up our obligations, it is no wonder that we find more than 40 percent of the Army deployed overseas.

Included in the oversea strength of our army are military assistance advisory groups and missions in almost all of the countries with which we are allied, as well as several others. Through these organizations, the United States contributes to the readiness of 80 percent of the free world's armies. This gives the equivalent of 200 combat divisions standing guard along the frontiers of freedom.

If, from this point on, I seem to overemphasize the mission of the army, it is only because most of you and I are more familiar and more personally concerned with this aspect of national defense.

In addition to our army forces deployed overseas, the army is maintaining in a constant state of readiness at home the STRAC. This corps of three divisions, with its motto: "Skilled, tough, ready around the clock," is the hard core of our strategic army force which is designed for immediate response, with a variety of firepower, in case of emergency.

STRAC's readiness, mobility, and variety of firepower are designed to confine and snuff out any localized conflict before it can spread into general war.

Immediate response is STRAC's specialty. It's combat-ready strength is always "on call" for rapid movement overseas, either to reinforce elements already deployed or to deal promptly with trouble at some previously unguarded or lightly held point. STRAC is our mobile troubleshooter, our "fire brigade."

Backing up STRAC, we have our strategic army forces at home and our fine reserve and National Guard units.

The factor exerting the greatest influence on our Nation today is change—worldwide political and sociological change, change in world power and tremendous and rapid technological change.

The Armed Forces must keep pace with developments. The latest in new weapons and equipment with which to respond to the threat must be made available not only to the Active Army, but to all elements of our one Army—the Active Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve—in adequate quantities to maintain combat readiness for any type of war. There still remains an area for improvement in the Army's readiness to do its share in preventing or countering aggression. That area is between what we can do with what we have and what we could do with additional quantities of modern weapons and equipment. There are encouraging signs that this gap may be narrowed appreciably in the near future. I refer, of course, to President Kennedy's recent statements concerning the provision of additional airlift and to the broader recognition which Army weapons and equipment modernization needs are receiving at this time.

As you recall, among the objectives advocated by the President, and long indorsed by the Army, which point the direction of the continuing reappraisal, are the following:

Sufficiently powerful and mobile forces to prevent the steady erosion of the free world through limited wars.

A flexible, selective, swift, and effective force to react to an attack on any part of the free world with any kind of weapons.

Increases in non-nuclear firepower and battlefield mobility to permit deliberate choices in weapons and strategy and reduce the danger of unnecessary escalation of a small war into a large war.

The expansion of special forces trained in guerrilla warfare.

The provision of adequate airlift and sealift to move elements of the Strategic Army Corps.

Substantial improvements in supporting tactical aircraft.

Additional emphasis on research and development on limited war requirements.

Stepped-up procurement of modern weapons and equipment.

Those are the President's objectives. I might say here, realizing that we are all taxpayers, that the Army has no greater responsibility than to see that every dollar it spends and every piece of equipment it pays for give maximum returns in performance. We understand the need for getting good value for our money in attaining these objectives.

Now, let me observe that wars are fought to gain or maintain control of people and the land they inhabit. The Army is the element of our overall military structure which is by law specifically created to gain or maintain such control. Its capabilities are designed both to meet national policy commitments and to react to the full spectrum of the threat within the scope of land warfare within the limitations of the resources made available to us. Your Army is ready and able to perform its job, is grateful to you for your past help in making this possible, and welcomes your continued interest.

Although I have talked mainly about Army achievements, I do not mean to imply that the Army alone is sufficient for national defense. The Armed Forces are a team—the defense team. In order to win either a nuclear or conventional war, each member has its own vital roles and missions. To be an effective "power for peace," the Armed Forces must be a balanced offensive-defensive force, with a balanced dual capability on land, on the sea, and in the air, together with a strategic air and sealift for swift movement of troops and supplies.

I would like to close with this thought by President Kennedy—expressed in an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors—to guide our actions for the future: "The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are to be swept away with the debris of history. Only the strong, only the industrious, only the determined, only the courageous, only the visionary, who determine the real nature of our struggle, can possibly survive."

Thank you.

Funds for Educating Africa May Save Billions Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of June 1, 1961. This article is written by Col. Talbot Patrick, the editor and publisher, who is an experienced traveler and continually exhibits the patriotic interests in the welfare of this country. I enclose the article as follows:

FUNDS FOR EDUCATING AFRICANS MAY SAVE BILLIONS LATER

(This is another in a series of letters to Evening Herald readers by Talbot Patrick, Herald editor and publisher. He is attending the annual congress of the International Press Institute in Tel Aviv, Israel.)

DEAR READERS: If you read the last letter, you'll remember I quoted from a book by Egypt's boss man about the "African Continent circle." Today there's a lot of action in line with ideas Gamal Abdel Nasser put into his book several years ago.

"We ourselves are in Africa," he wrote. "Surely the people of Africa will continue to look to us—we who are the guardians of the continent's northern gate, we who constitute the connecting link between the continent and the outer world. * * * We surely cannot under any condition stand as mere onlookers."

And so Nasser welcomes with big escorts and banners visits by heads of new African nations. Particularly welcome are heads of those nations which break all ties with countries of which formely they were colonies.

Representatives of peoples in African areas still seeking indepedence are more than welcomed; Egypt finances them. The example most noticed by the outside world was the "government" of Algeria which for years carried on the guerrilla war for Algerian independence from Cairo headquarters.

Much less organized, but just as fanatic in seeking independence, are smaller groups from all over the continent of Africa. It isn't very expensive for Egypt to provide shelter and food and a small office for those who can't finance themselves. And it certainly is a way for Egypt to make friends and influence people. People who may in time become influential.

And of course money goes to some or all of these groups from Communist representatives, too.

I wouldn't suggest that our United States do anything of that sort.

But the United States is missing a wonderful opportunity in failure to do anything about the young people from all over Africa who come to Cairo. They want education. They want training by which they can help both themselves and their home lands adjust to the modern world. And, when they return to home lands where the educated and trained are few in number, they will be important people in international as well as home affairs.

Cairo is a natural place for these young people to try to reach. It is the big city of Africa. It has universities. For those who are Moslems, Cairo University stands as the centuries-old center of Islamic education.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Once again we find our wonderful country faced with grave danger. There are loose in the world those forces who would destroy us.

And, even as our honored war dead were called upon to summon their last ounce of courage and endurance, we citizens of today must once again face the foe with forbearance and unswerving determination.

For if the proud heritage we cherish today is to endure, Americans again must meet the clarion call to oppose those who would doom us.

If we can but equal the qualities possessed by the men we honor here today, there is no foe we cannot conquer, no conspiracy we cannot overcome, no challenge we cannot meet.

This is the message for each of us here today as we pay honor to the departed ones of all wars. Glory to the battle dead. And honor to those who returned home and have since passed on.

Honor to the sons and to the father, to the husbands and to the brothers. Also, honor and comfort to the beloved survivors of those departed ones.

May our thoughts, our words and our deeds always fulfill the high ideals for which the brave have sacrificed. The obligation is ours to assure that the honored dead shall not have died in vain.

The Accrual Accounting Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman BRAD MORSE, has been performing a noteworthy task for the American taxpayer in urging that President Kennedy implement a law which the President, during his Senate days, played a major part in enacting. The following editorial from the Washington Star is a well-deserved tribute to Congressman MORSE's efforts in this area:

[From the Evening Star, May 19, 1961]

TIME TO RESURRECT IT

Representative BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts has given President Kennedy a timely reminder that a law which the President sponsored as a Senator has been buried alive. This is the Hoover Commission's plan for curbing the piling up by Federal departments of unexpended appropriations from previous years. We agree with Representative MORSE that it is time to put this money-saving plan into action—and the President, who worked so hard to obtain passage of the law 3 years ago, is in a good position to start the ball rolling.

The law, known as the Accrual Accounting Act, requires the departments to report fully on all funds appropriated in previous years but not spent and to justify such funds as carryover items. Congress then would decide whether to put a limitation on specific accumulations and to what extent. Mr. Kennedy told the Senate in 1957 that this system would "prevent a great carryover of funds, both with respect to foreign aid and defense, which makes it almost impossible for us (Congress) to know exactly what we are doing, and the effect our actions will have on the amount of money available to the executive branch."

The Eisenhower administration asked Congress to place an accrued-funds limitation on several appropriations, but nothing was done. The new administration so far has made no request that the law be made effective through congressional limitations on carryover funds. Apparently it will take pressure from the White House to obtain action at the Capitol. We hope that the President, as author of the law, will make every reasonable effort to see that it does not remain a dead duck.

Indecision Hurts the United States Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the free world is looking to America for leadership. If we fail to take a firm stand, and just talk about freedom, we will lose the confidence of the uncommitted nations and when that happens we could well lose the cold war. It may be well for Members of Congress to think about the thoughts expressed in the following excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report so that whatever pressure possible may be brought upon the President to stop talking and back up some of the fine sentiments he has already set forth, before it is too late:

Trouble for United States is out in the world, not so much at home.

Trouble's cause? Lack of an objective. Lack of nerve. Wavering allies. A feeling by politicians that Americans would rather be comfortable than act.

A new President, too, has appeared uncertain, somewhat bewildered.

Cuba, more and more, appears as a major blunder. Invasion of Cuba was going well. Defections from Castro had started. Castro's militia did suffer heavy casualties. Castro's tanks were sitting ducks to air attack. Also an aircraft carrier was just offshore. But air support, vital to the whole operation, promised by United States for the invasion, was denied.

Why? Because the original plan, endorsed by military, was not used. Back of that? CIA took hold, moved on its own, not on military recommendations. Civilians interfered with a military operation in progress, got disaster. Pilots, begging to answer pleas from shore, had to sit on their hands.

Who was in on the operation? Everybody who gets in on any operations of a military nature. White House, CIA, military services—all of them, including Coast Guard. Could it have worked? Military answer: Yes, if plans as drawn had been given a chance to work out, instead of being changed in middle.

What about Laos? Was that the same? Not quite. There U.S. allies just faded away. Nobody, including United States, wanted to take a chance on shooting.

Khrushchev, using others to do his fighting, played it tough and won.

Result of Cuba and Laos: U.S. word is in question. All around the world it's being openly wondered whether U.S. promises will be honored if tested.

It now might take actual shooting to prove United States means what it says.

Isn't Kennedy to straighten out Khrushchev in Vienna? It's unlikely.

Remember this: Kennedy's public life is that of a debater, a talker. Khrushchev's life—a long one—has been that of a ruthless man of action.

Words, to Kennedy, mean much. Words, to Khrushchev, aren't important. The Russians use words as a cover, while getting ready for actions.

So now what? New idea in Washington is to "stabilize the periphery." The meaning? Deal with Khrushchev on the future of "fringe" countries.

Something new? No, not really new. It formerly was called "appeasement," but that word came into disrepute so a phrase is being substituted. Trouble is that the "periphery" for Russia keeps pushing out as Communism spreads.

Khrushchev's technique: Deal. Nail down new conquests. Then push on.

Actually, if the world only knew it, Communists are in trouble, too.

Red China's population is on short rations. Communism in China, as in Russia and elsewhere, is unable to solve the problem of agriculture. Russia, too, is having continued trouble with farmers. In the Soviet Union there's a return to capital punishment for a wide range of offenses.

Eastern Europe, Russia's colonial empire, has the troubles of all of today's colonies. People are restive and can be stirred up.

Then why all the fear of the Communist countries? It's a mystery.

Western Europe, alone, is vastly stronger than Russia. Add United States and there is no comparison in potential strength. Add Japan and the comparison is even more one-sided. It's probably three-to-one odds on the non-Communist side.

But: Except for United States, no country seems much interested in defense.

The trouble? Apparently only the Communists have a real objective for which they keep working. It seems that no country wants to try very hard to buck the spread of Communism. There's a great desire to live in ease.

Result is that Khrushchev is having things pretty much his own way.

Robert Welch Has No Connection With the Candy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the May 9, 1961, issue of the Candy Industry and Confectioners Journal, which gives some sidelights about the controversial founder of the John Birch Society. The most important point made is that Robert Welch has no connection whatsoever with the candy industry.

This editorial was written by Don Gussow, a brilliant gentleman who has become the acknowledged spokesman for the candy industry in the United States. Candy Industry is edited and published

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

in New York and is probably the greatest single influence in the candy industry today.

The editorial follows:

THE BOB WELCH STORY

This editorial deals with an unusual subject. The subject is Bob Welch and the John Birch Society.

This writer has known Robert Henry Winborne Welch, Jr., for over 25 years. We have not seen, nor been in contact with him for the past 4 years, when he resigned his post as vice president and sales manager of the James O. Welch Co., Cambridge, Mass.

We remember Bob Welch as an articulate, highly intelligent, imaginative and very much involved person. We do not recall Bob Welch's taking the middle road on any subject. When Bob Welch became involved in a situation, he was fully and wholly involved. Almost literally bouncing with nervous energy, Bob Welch could not remain sitting or standing still in one position for more than a second. A compulsive worker, Bob Welch toiled almost around the clock. After a full, hectic, rat-tat-tat day in his office (which usually included a series of conferences, numerous telephone conversations and voluminous dictation given to a patient, highly competent secretary) Bob would rush off to deliver a talk before some political or community group, return to his office and, after a biref nap, go on with more work until the early hours of the morning. This was par for Bob Welch's working day course.

His after hours work more often than not pertained to chores other than those of the candy business. During the hours from 10 at night until 4 in the morning, he would dash off a few chapters of a book, write a speech, or spend the time in researching a particular problem in which he might be involved at that particular time.

Among his many activities, Bob Welch participated in candy association work. He served on many committees and at one time was chairman of the Washington Committee of the National Confectioners Association. He won the Kettle Award in 1947. He was the second to receive this honor.

Bob Welch always seemed to have been offbeat. He loved chess and played with experts. At one time he carried on a game by mail. He hasn't played much chess during the past dozen years. We remember Bob Welch as a gifted writer with a fine sense of humor. He could and did write humorous verse. He also wrote one of the easiest to read and most meaningful books on salesmanship.

Bob Welch had the benefit of a good education. North Carolina born, Bob attended a 1-room country school, high school, and had 4 years at the University of North Carolina, 2 years at the U.S. Naval Academy, and 2 at Harvard Law School. Bob never did become a lawyer.

In 1946 and again in 1948 Bob went to England, primarily to study the effect of the Socialist government. In 1949 Bob took a month's flying trip around the world, spending most of the time in Asia. Shortly afterwards he wrote a book dealing with the dismissal of Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur, entitled "May God Forgive Us." It was published by the Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, in 1952. About 200,000 copies (both hardbound and paperbound) were sold in the first year of publication.

From that time on Bob was not quite the same. Now intensely serious, gaunt in appearance, he began to develop a morbid fear of communism and Communists. In 1955 he went to Asia once again, this time visiting Syngman Rhee, then President of Korea, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, and other high-ranking members of the Chinese National Government in Taipei, Taiwan. In the fall of 1956 he called on Chancellor Conrad Adenauer in Bonn, West Germany.

In 1956 he began to publish a little magazine called One Man's Opinion, which carried long, involved dissertations on communism. He did this at his own expense and in his spare time—probably between the hours of 10 at night and 4 in the morning, and on weekends.

He dabbled in politics, made hundreds of speeches, and even made an unsuccessful attempt to obtain the Republican nomination for lieutenant governor in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

When Bob Welch felt that he could not give up his outside political and doctrinaire activities and at the same time continue his job as sales manager, he resigned his post in the James O. Welch Co. That was late in 1956. He was succeeded by his very competent assistant, Bob Daugherty. For the record, Bob Welch never owned and does not now own any stock in the Welch Candy Co.

From then on Bob Welch became even more obsessed with the job of fighting communism than ever before. He expanded the publication of his magazine (the name was changed from One Man's Opinion to American Opinion), wrote pamphlets and tracts and made endless speeches. Two years ago he founded the John Birch Society. (In 1954 he wrote a book on the life of John Birch, published that year by the Henry Regnery Co.)

At this writing Robert H. W. Welch is one of the most controversial figures in the country. So much has been published about the John Birch Society in the past few months that a detailed report is not needed here. It is not for us to criticize or question its motives.

Every right-thinking American is opposed to communism. Our Nation (together with its allies and friends) today is involved in a serious, life and death struggle with the Communists. Whether the methods used by the John Birch Society are the right or wrong ones, seems to be the concern of many as evidenced in reports in the daily press. Certainly the use of communistic tactics is abhorrent to those who love and are devoted to freedom. Immoral means still do not justify moral ends.

One of the purposes of bringing this story about Bob Welch and the John Birch Society to the attention of our readers is to underline its possible implications in the industry. Obviously, it is unfortunate that news dispatches almost invariably refer to Mr. Welch as a retired candy manufacturer. This is not good public relations for candy and the candy industry. But we have complete confidence in the fairmindedness of our people. We question whether anyone would stop eating candy because he did not approve of what Robert Welch is saying or what the John Birch Society stands for.

We credit candy jobbers and dealers with the same fairmindedness. We question whether they will equate Bob Welch's activities with the marketing policies of the James O. Welch Co., with which he has no connection whatsoever.

In a statement to the press the other day, James O. Welch, president of the company bearing his name, stated that neither he nor his company shared his brother's point of view. "I know that there must be many of our customers who not only disagree with Bob Welch's viewpoint, but may be very much disturbed over his activities," Mr. Welch said.

"Our company emphatically has nothing to do with the John Birch Society, and my brother Robert has no connection with this company and owns no stock in it," Mr. Welch added.

In a measure, it is a pity that the highly respected head of a very important candy company has found it necessary to defend himself in this manner. Jim Welch is one of the most honorable, highly respected of men in the candy business. His integrity is unquestioned. He is not interested in headlines. He has had but one interest since he started making fudge in the kitchen of his home, when quite young, just married, and in need of finding a way to make a living. And his single interest today is to make the best possible candy and sell it in the most honorable fashion.

We have full confidence in the fairmindedness on the part of members of this industry and their human qualities to understand this difficult situation.

East Central Parts of Oregon Attract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Oregon Journal of May 15, indicates a few of the reasons for the increasing popularity of central Oregon among visitors from other parts of the State and tourists from other States:

EAST CENTRAL PARTS OF OREGON ATTRACT
(By Paul Manley)

To the road traveler, central and east-central Oregon presents an ever-changing panorama of scenery.

The hilly country around Bend, with its breathtaking views of snow-capped Cascades Range peaks, rapidly gives way to flat, treeless rangeland en route to Burns; and northward from this cattle capital, rugged, pine-studded skiing terrain is encountered abruptly.

These are but surface impressions, and the motorists who pauses to delve beneath the rought exterior will find friendly people in quaint, historic communities with enough unusual, off-the-beaten-track phenomena to make the endeavor rewarding.

North of Redmond, for example, a turn-off on U.S. Highway 97 provides a spectacular view of the Crooked River Canyon. (Nearby, incidentally, the Deschutes River fishing is not to be overlooked.)

At Bend the highway leads directly past peaceful Pioneer Park, a pleasant enough sight and well worth more than a cursory glance. Springtime plantings of vivid red and yellow tulips will soon be replaced by summer blooms, and there are a pair of blackheaded Canada geese and a horde of multicolored mallard ducks almost tame enough to let youngsters pet them.

Burns, like an oasis in the desert, caters to the traveler's needs. Service stations and motels dominate the intersections, but there are also window displays of water skis and fishing tackle, which excite the curiosity of visitors to this arid region.

From Burns, tourists and sportsmen with time and energy will point their cars southward, to the picturesque Steens Mountains and the Malheur Game Refuge, which teem with wildlife and migratory birds, while the pedal pusher hurrying homeward will be treated to reminders of the past in the valleys of Canyon Creek and the John Day River to the north.

Beside the highway between Burns and John Day lie the rotting remains of many a homesteader's cabin, amid luxuriant stands of ponderosa pine; and less than 2 miles

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

solid fuel propulsion vehicle or missile before the Committee on Science and Astronautics on February 4, 1959, stated that the Polaris project was a bold strikeout in solid propellant developments while the rest of the national effort was being channeled into the liquid fuel path. He stated further that this two-pronged approach was a gamble that paid off handsomely.

If we in the United States want to equal or exceed the Russians in space, we need not only the liquid fuel propulsion but also the solid fuel approach, and likewise we should have the nuclear and the electric propulsion fuel as further approaches in the future for operating vehicles in space.

I would like to comment further on the supplemental views as contained in the committee report. There is really not a difference of $141,600,000 between the committee approach and the two Members filing supplemental views. There is only $126,600,000 difference. The $15 million for emergency construction of facilities is in each of the figures. So that our new figure of the committee of $1,376,900,000 is simply an increase of the Bureau of the Budget figure of $1,250,300,000.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would like to make the statement that we miss the gentleman sorely on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but we are so happy he is doing such a good job on the other committee.

Mr. FULTON. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Newspaper Columnist Holmes Alexander has written an excellent article concerning the John Birch Society. It is noteworthy that Mr. Alexander is not a member of the society. The article was released through the McNaught Syndicate, Inc., on May 8, 1961. Under unanimuos consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ROBERT WELCH AND WALTER JUDD
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Many will write to say that it takes a foolhardy columnist to rise and defend the John Birch Society, especially when he's not a member. My answer would be that it took the touch of the desperado to discover the new world, the two polar regions, medical anesthetics, and many inaccessible but abstract truths as well. Nothing ventured; nothing gained.

Robert Welch, founder and president of the John Birch Society, has pondered long and reached the considered opinion that the Eisenhower brothers have not been anti-Communist enough, and that Chief Justice Earl Warren is a menace to the American Republic. These are extreme positions, rendered more extreme by misquotation and distortion. But Welch made them in hot blood in an era when the battle is going against us internally, externally, morally, and psychologically. With Mr. Kennedy's disasters in Cuba, Laos, and Geneva, added to Mr. Eisenhower's in Japan, Paris, the U–2 case, and Mr. Truman's in Potsdam, Korea, and Hungary, it doesn't seem too much to forgive a high-tempered man for using rough language.

If Welch owes some apologies (as I believe he does), many persons owe the same to him. It is insulting for a gray-haired superpatriot (why is that noun a smutty word?) to be called a Fascist, dictator, Nazi, hatemonger, and antisemite. All these are epithets capable of inciting personal and professional injury to Welch and, by unfair association, to his followers. Welch has denied that he is, or would ever be, any of these things. He and several John Birch Society members have asked to be examined before congressional committees so as to refute these accusations under oath.

Meanwhile, one of our largest and finest newspapers, which severely reprimanded Welch and the John Birch Society, has been deluged with letter from Americans who want to know how to join the society. There is the charge of sinister secrecy. But merely by asking an acknowledged member, I tucked under my arm and brought away for study a lot of John Birch Society literature. My haul included the much-discussed Blue Book, and the member's Monthly Message with a blank space and this notice: "John Birch Society, Belmont 78, Mass. Gentlemen, I should like to make the following comments or suggestions." It doesn't read like authoritarianism to me.

The society is a perfectly furious anti-Communist organization which advocates giving the Reds some of their own medicine. By implication, this could mean taking Havana as ruthlessly as Khrushchev took Budapest, training guerillas and subversives to upset Communist governments, making anti-Americans as unpopular in America as anti-Reds are in Communist lands.

Much of the John Birch Society policy is shocking to prudish Americans (and those who affect prudishness to show off their "couthness"), but the other day Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican of Minnesota, made the same philosophic points in much more eloquent, more cogent language. Speaking before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, JUDD insisted (as does the John Birch Society) that we can't apply Judeo-Christian ethics or American codes of honor and chivalry to communism. JUDD said:

"The reason why it is not possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world—whether at Yalta or the U.N., at Panmunjom, at Geneva or at Paris—is because the Communists are not pursing the same goals as we, at our best, are pursuing.

"And why are they not pursuing the same goals as we? It is because they do not believe in the same things as we do—about man and about the universe; that is, about God. One reason for our difficulties is that we have been exposed so long and so consistently to the Judeo-Christian body of ethics that we take its moral standards for granted. We tend to equate "Christian" with "human"—and since the men in Moscow and Peiping are human beings we assume they will act as Christians do.

"We cannot readily condemn esthetic Communists for betraying Christian values which they have never professed, and which in fact they deny. It is absurd to believe that they can make moral judgments when their creed tells them that man is not a moral being, but is an economical animal."

Robert Welch and WALTER JUDD, though miles apart in their ability to articulate, are trying to say much the same thing, which is this: Let's stop treating Communists like moral equals.

Please Tell Us Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will consider the controversial issue of Federal aid to education. A recent issue of the Aurora Advertiser in my district contains an outstanding editorial on this subject, and I submit it below for insertion in the RECORD for consideration by those who will be asked to vote on this issue:

PLEASE TELL US WHY

We have watched with puzzled amazement the almost fanatic fervor with which educators and many others have worked in a relentless campaign which seems, at last, headed for success—and wondered why.

The crusade, of course, is that for Federal aid to education.

Federal aid to education can come, of course, only from taxes paid by the people. State aid to education comes also from taxes paid by exactly the same people. Local tax support from schools comes from taxes paid by the same people, all of whom live in some school district.

Why so many should believe there is inherent magic of some sort in channeling tax money to Washington and then sending a part of it back that makes it different from sending it to the State capital and back, or the county seat and back we can not understand. We have asked proponents to explain the difference, and have never found one who could do so that we could understand.

Two things we know. There is not, at present, an expensive Federal bureau to receive tax money and distribute it to the schools. If the Federal aid program goes through, there will be. And the cost of this bureau will have to be collected to pay Federal aid, and therefore is an extra expense to the people.

Already, in every State, there is machinery for collecting school tax money and distributing it. Already in every county, there is the same sort of organization. Both will continue if Federal aid is instituted.

Though they deny it frantically, the real goal, we believe, of Federal aid to education is Federal control of education. Proponents want a sort of civil service for educators. They want national standards, handed down from above. In their hearts, they lack confidence in the ability of the people to make decisions concerning the schools their children attend. The educators concerned lack self-confidence in their own leadership.

Any long-time member of a school board in Missouri, can point out definite losses of initiative which have followed the shifting of the financial burden of schools from the local district to the State. Nearly all of the orders from above which have forced changes in standards and curricula have been for the good. But, in the wrong hands, and that governmental bodies do fall into wrong hands has been demonstrated in countless incidents in the history of the world, they could just as easily be bad as good.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

That Federal aid to education will be accompanied by a certain amount of Federal control of education follows as logically as night follows day. It has been an inescapable aftermath of Federal aid programs in every field which the Federal Government has entered.

In the hands of a would-be Hitler, or a would-be Stalin, such power to control the education of youth is so dangerous that the American people should entrust it to no one.

We believe, sadly, that Federal aid to education is upon us. Only a last-minute storm of protest can head off its dangers now, and there are no signs of such a storm.

And we wonder why.

Police to Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, about 4 weeks ago, I called attention of the Senate to an article in Parade magazine dealing with puzzling traffic situations on our highways. The answers to those situations were supplied by the Delaware State Police, an organization which has been accorded international honors. Today I would like to again call attention to an article in the same magazine which tells the story of Delaware's bold new plan to keep youngsters out of trouble. Very simply, the plan involves the sending of a letter to the parents of a boy or girl who has been contacted by the State police either for directly violating a law or being in a group which has violated a law. The letter merely explains the situation under which the boy or girl was contacted and serves to inform parents of the whereabouts and the doings of their youngsters.

This forward-looking plan was the brain child of Lt. Hugh Collins of the Delaware State Police and has been in effect for about 1 year. Its success is measured in the fact that it is a rare day when a youngster whose parents have received such a letter turns up in court. Also, the State of Connecticut has copied the program and youth workers throughout the country are watching this modern-day application of the old adage "A stitch in time * * *."

I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues and congratulate the Delaware State Police, under Col. John P. Ferguson, for their outstanding work in this and other fields of police work.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE TO PARENTS

(By E. D. Fales, Jr.)

DOVER, DEL.—A few weeks ago, the mother of a teenaged girl took an official-looking letter from her mailbox here. It bore the emblem of the Delaware State Police.

"Dear Mrs. Jones," the letter began. "On U.S. Route 40 last night your daughter Helen, 15, was contacted by State police. When she came to our attention she was a passenger in a car driven by a 17-year-old boy, who was arrested for driving in excess of 80 miles an hour and racing.

"Your daughter violated no law but was in great peril, and we thought you should know so you can advise her. The boy had been arrested before for dangerous driving. Respectfully, Col. John P. Ferguson, Superintendent of State police."

That same morning, identical letters went to the parents of 10 other teenagers who had been in the race. And in the past year, hundreds more have gone to families all over Delaware. For in a unique—and controversial—program State police here are using letters to parents to combat the new problem of teenage wildness. By stitch-in-time warnings, police hope they can help keep kids out of serious trouble and perhaps even save young lives.

WHERE ARE THEY TONIGHT?

The program deals not with delinquents but with "good kids" who might be led astray, and its premise is simple. In this age of speed and distance, police say, even the best parent can't know every minute what a youngster is doing or whom he's doing it with. The cop on the beat and the neighborhood grapevine used to keep parents informed. But today's teenagers roam far from home, and scant news of their conduct gets back to parents. Pointed notes from police seek to span that gap.

The Delaware program is being watched closely by youth workers everywhere, and one State, Connecticut, already has copied it. Not every parent approves. But police say it pays off: it's a rare day when a youngster whose parents have received a letter later turns up in court. Typical is the case of Helen Jones (a fictitious name, like all other names of parents and teenagers in this article). After her mother received the police letter, she wrote a grateful reply:

"I've been worried sick and I've been trying to warn her," Mrs. Jones wrote. "But she told me times had changed and I didn't understand.

"Then your letter came. Thank you for saving me from being an old fogey."

Since then, Helen hasn't been seen with her old companions. But, says Lt. Hugh Collins, who dreamed up the letter idea, police see many others like her. "They're nice kids, but naive," asserts Collins, a tall, quiet officer. "They run with bad companions and wild drivers. They're the kind we often pull out from some sickening wreck."

Just such a wreck inspired Lieutenant Collins with his idea in the first place. On a Delaware highway several years ago, a carful of frightened teenagers spun into a curve at 70 miles per hour, crashed through a fence, landed in a field and overturned. By the greatest of miracles, no one was hurt. The driver, a 17-year-old showoff, was arrested. But because there were no further arrests and no injuries, parents of the other youngsters were not notified.

Two months later, some of the same crowd were out with another wild driver. There was another wreck. This time, two of them died.

"That set me to thinking," Lieutenant Collins says. "These kids would have been alive if we had alerted their parents. It seemed to me that we ought to be able to warn parents in such cases, so that they could take action. The letters program was the result."

Since the program was launched, more than 1,200 letters have been sent out. The police have dealt with all kinds of situations and approached all strata of parents. The letters are usually extremely blunt.

"Dear Mr. and Mrs. Adams," reads a typical letter. "Saturday at 1:15 a.m. your daughter Mary Jane, 17, was contacted by a trooper north of Dover on U.S. Route 13. When brought to our attention she was asleep on the rear seat of a parked car operated by one Joseph Blank, 19. Mr. Blank was asleep in the front seat of the car."

"Dear Mr. and Mrs. Smith," reads another. "Sunday at 11:20 p.m. your son Billy, 14, was in a car driven by Peter Jackson, 16. Peter was arrested for drag racing and running a red light. Both of these are dangerous practices and not in your son's best interests. Peter has been arrested before."

Sometimes a letter also contains a short lecture. Recently a carful of high school students was stopped after a minor accident. The letter that went to parents of one girl included these statements:

"The events that followed had all the appearance of a mob scene, with a lot of unnecessary shouting, crowding and smart remarks.

MOM WAS ALL SHOOK

"We feel reasonably sure this is not the way you would like your 14-year-old daughter Phyllis to act when abroad. Perhaps by having this brought to your attention you can prevail on her to act the part of a young lady."

How do most parents react when such a letter arrives? To find out, Parade went to the home of Ben Brown, who was stopped with a carload of drag racers.

"Mom was all shook when the letter came," Ben said. "Let's face it. I never would have told her about the race. But when the letter came she made me tell her every detail."

Mrs. Brown talked the matter over with Ben, admonished him, and then turned him over to his father. The two had a man-to-man talk. "I was able to explain that the one thing everyone has to guard against is being pushed into trouble by the 'someone' in every crowd who has a stronger will," Mr. Brown says. "Next time my boy won't be led."

In other homes, there are emotional scences, laying down of the law or the woodshed treatment. And often parents of teenagers "ground" their children, by canceling their car privileges.

HELPFUL OR HIGHHANDED?

Some parents take a dim view of the whole procedure. They deplore the fact that each letter is accompanied by a questionnaire, asking, among other things, "What is your attitude?" (toward the letters) and whether the teenager "admits to participation."

And parents who do not return the questionnaire receive another, sterner letter. They are asked why they did not return the questionnaire and even asked for the name of anyone who advised them not to reply.

Even more important, parents say, is the fact that the letter becomes part of a police file—albeit a confidential one, available only to the courts. Since no legal wrong has been committed, some parents consider this procedure highhanded and possibly even illegal. State police counter by saying that the file is destroyed when the youngster reaches 18.

But parents interviewed by Parade overwhelmingly approved the idea. "It closes a big gap created by the automobile between us and our children," one can said, "Maybe the police shouldn't be doing it—but who else could?"

Some teenagers said they were in favor of police vigilance; others gave approval grudgingly. But one summed up the minority feeling: "If we violate no law, what business is it of anyone's?"

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

the Associated Press with the heading "ADA Says Red China Should Be Recognized." Mr. Speaker, the Americans for Democratic Action are up to their old tricks of advocating recognition by the United States of Red China as well as admission to the United Nations.

Many of the people associated with the ADA formed the policies years ago that caused the loss of free China behind the Iron Curtain of communism, as well as the loss of many other countries. Certainly their policies at that time were wrong and the policies they advocate today are just as bad and as detrimental to the interest of the United States and the free world:

ADA SAYS RED CHINA SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED

(By the Associated Press)

Americans for Democratic Action urges a start toward diplomatic recognition of Red China "and its accreditation to the United Nations as the government of China."

This should not be done, the ADA said, "as gestures of moral approval of past actions but as a means of establishing the normal channels of international communication."

The ADA's views on China were in a resolution adopted yesterday before its 14th annual convention adjourned.

PROVISIONS FOR FORMOSA

Recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the United Nations, the ADA said, "would increase our access to information on Chinese affairs and the possibility of affecting Chinese foreign policy."

Admitting Red China to the United Nations, the ADA said, "should be linked to the condition that the inhabitants of Formosa shall themselves democratically decide whether they shall be admitted to the United Nations as an independent nation or that they shall rejoin mainland China."

The Chinese seat at the United Nations now is held by representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government, which is based on Formosa.

On domestic matters, ADA, a self-described liberal organization, said the Kennedy administration was "drifting into the worst mistakes of the Eisenhower years."

The ADA defined them as "improvisations for segments of full employment and economic growth."

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The resolution recommended a number of long-range objectives, including:

Expanded support for neglected segments of the economy, notably housing, urban redevelopment, water conservation, depressed areas and constantly expanding consumer purchasing power for a rising standard of living.

The convention reelected Samuel H. Beer, a Harvard professor, as chairman; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as honorary chairman; Richard C. Sachs, New York, treasurer, and Roy Bennett, New York, assistant treasurer. Paul Seabury, a University of California professor, was elected chairman of the executive committee.

The Case Against Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Arthur Krock writes in the New York Times this morning an article that to me represents a devastating reply to those who contend that this country had not given Cuban Dictator Castro fair treatment.

Frankly, a surprising number of my own constituents persist in arguing with me that we have been too harsh and peremptory in our treatment of Castro. Because this badly mistaken view may be shared by many Americans, I ask unanimous consent that the column in today's New York Times, entitled "The Lively Issue of Castro's Justifications," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIVELY ISSUE OF CASTRO'S JUSTIFICATIONS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 17—Two conclusions reached by this department after an examination of the origins of the currently hostile United States-Castro relations, and published here under date of May 10, have evoked an unusual number of remarkably uniform dissents from readers. These conclusions were:

1. The factual weakness of an advertisement in this newspaper, signed by a number of Harvard professors among other distinguished citizens, which justified Castro's anti-Americanism on the ground that for "at least a year" U.S. policy has been "We must crush Castro," is that it began the chapter of United States-Castro relations in the middle.

2. Castro's unfriendly and illegal acts, and his anti-American incitements of the Cuban population, long preceded the date chosen in this advertisement to demonstrate that the burden of blame is on his government.

In rebuttal of these conclusions the letterwriters generally contended that the United States refused a request from Castro to be invited for talks; rebuffed and snubbed him when he came here in February 1959, to speak to the American Society of Newspaper Editors; and refused his offer at that time and thereafter to negotiate the differences between his regime and the Government of the United States. But the open record is the following:

1. Castro never requested an official invitation. When, on his own volition, he came unofficially to Washington, in April 1959, Secretary of State Herter gave him a luncheon at which no mention of any desired negotiation was made by the Cuban officials present; and, in the absence of President Eisenhower, the Premier was received by Vice President Nixon.

2. On February 22, 1960, Castro did propose—but for the first time—to negotiate with the United States on compensation to American citizens for their property in Cuba that he expropriated soon after his accession to power. However, his conditions were that during the negotiation the United States should bind both the Executive and Congress to refrain from any action which Cuba would consider to affect its interests, while he remained free to negotiate or procrastinate as he chose—conditions obviously unacceptable and, so far as Congress was concerned, constitutionally impossible.

3. From the time Castro assumed power until May 17, 1960, the United States made 9 formal and 16 informal offers to negotiate all differences with Cuba. The first was by Ambassador Bonsal in March 1959. In each note and statement the United States expressed sympathy with the social and economic objectives of the Cuban agrarian reform law under which the expropriation was made.

HERTER'S INDICTMENT

4. At the San José, Costa Rica, conference, August 1960, Cuban Foreign Minister Roa charged that this Government had consistently refused Castro's offers of negotiation. Secretary Herter made and documented this reply: That continuing attacks on the United States by the Castro regime began in January 1959 before the acts it alleges were U.S. aggression. He said also that from this date forward political assaults on the U.S. Government, "and scurrilous attempts to besmirch the characters of its leaders, have nevertheless been consistent and made with increased savagery."

The circumstances that the charges in Castro's justification that this open record refutes are being made by citizens of such quality is strange, disturbing, and mysterious. But it is true, as pointed out in some of the letters, that Castro also can cite grievances prior to the preinvasion programing. For example, the United States did not completely bar arms to dictator Batista until March 14, 1958; sent a marine guard for the Guantanamo pumping station 6 miles into Cuba on July 28, 1958; and concluded a 20-year atomic energy aid agreement with Batista September 9, 1958.

The silly paradox, however, is that all this time U.S. businessmen in Cuba were knowingly financing Castro's revolution by paying their taxes at stations where he could seize them. Prior to that, the taxes on Cuban properties owned by Americans were always sent to Havana, the central collection office, until the other arrangement was deliberately made for the financing of Castro. And meanwhile the State Department was totally ignoring successive warnings from two Ambassadors that the interest of international communism would be served in Cuba by Castro's success.

The John Birch Society—1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a leading newspaper published in Whittier, Calif., a city located in my district, has printed a series of five objectively written articles concerning the John Birch Society. This newspaper, the Daily News, is to be commended for basing the articles on facts which many news media have ignored in reporting on the society. Under unanimous consent I include the first three articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 26, 1961]

HOW TO TELL A COMMIE FRONT

(First of a series)

The John Birch Society may be a movement aimed at strengthening Americanism and weakening communism, but it is mysterious and controversial, too.

Mysterious although its meetings are public and its membership open to any good American who will subscribe to its beliefs.

Controversial although its business is Americanism.

It has been subjected to criticism by political officeholders, newspaper editors, church pastors, and the man on the street. There has been clamoring for an investigation of its purpose and organization and its founder, Robert Welch.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

IGNORANCE OR MISUNDERSTANDING

Public ignorance or, at least, misunderstanding may be the cause of accusations that have run the gamut from dictatorship to Klan.

But the Birch Society is neither dictatorial nor a form of the infamous Ku Klux Klan, according to Whittier chapter leaders.

Five of the leaders have compiled a five-part series of articles explaining the aims and objects of the society. The series has been jointly written by Augustine Cervantes, of South Whittier; Joseph Coffman, of La Habra; Raye King, V. C. Ramler, and Joseph Sullivan, all of Whittier.

The first article in the series follows:

HOW TO TELL ONE

J. Edgar Hoover tells us in his book, "Masters of Deceit," that a Communist-front organization can be detected by applying the following test:

1. Does the organization espouse the cause of Soviet Russia? Does it shift when the party line shifts?

2. Does the organization feature as speakers at its meetings known Communists or sympathizers?

3. Does the organization sponsor causes, campaigns, literature, petitions, or other activities sponsored by the party or other front organizations?

4. Is the organization used as a sounding board by, or is it endorsed by Communist-controlled labor unions?

5. Does its literature follow the Communist line or is it printed by the Communist press?

6. Does the organization receive consistent favorable mention in Communist publications?

7. Does the organization represent itself to be nonpartisan yet engage in political activities and consistently advocate causes favored by the Communists? Does it denounce both Fascists and Communists?

8. Does the organization denounce American foreign policy while always lauding Soviet policy?

9. Does the organization utilize Communist doubletalk by referring to Soviet dominated countries as democracies, complaining that the United States is imperialistic and constantly denouncing monopoly capital?

10. Have outstanding leaders in public life openly renounced affiliation with the organization?

ATTRACT OR DENOUNCE?

11. Does the organization, if espousing liberal, progressive causes, attract well-known honest, patriotic liberals or does it denounce well known liberals?

12. Does the organization consistently consider matters not directly related to its avowed purposes and objectives?

Let us assume that the average apathetic but patriotic citizen had just read the above 12 items and decided to apply these measures to the organizations in his circles of acquaintanceship. Would he be able to do so effectively? The answer is obvious. He would need to become trained to apply the above measures intelligently. This then requires a thorough education and background in dialectical materialistic communism. How does one receive this type of education so necessary in our defense against internal subversion?

DIALECTIC MATERIALISM

There are a number of organizations usually local in nature which to a pretty good job of teaching dialectic materialism. However, December 1958 Robert Welch recognized the need for a national organization to train and recruit those already trained into an effective coordinated group. This resulted in the conception of the John Birch Society.

Up until the John Birch Society was organized, well-informed and well-trained patriots more or less worked as individuals or in uncoordinated groups and as such did not worry the Communists except as a nuisance. However, after the origin of the John Birch Society, those thousands of concerned people recognizing their former inadequacy in fighting communism joined the society in such numbers that the Communist Party became alarmed and decided to apply their proven forces against them. It was recognized that at the present rate of growth the John Birch Society could attain almost unlimited power to cope with them and thus destroy 40 years of labor. It should be understood that the present status of Communist power in the United States had, except for a brief but fatal effort by Senator Joseph McCarthy, been reached through almost continuous default on the part of the American people

---

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 27, 1961]

CONCERNED SHOULD BECOME INFORMED

(This is the second of a five-part series on the John Birch Society. The articles were jointly written by Augustine Cervantes, Joseph Coffman, Raye King, V. C. Ramler, and Joseph Sullivan, all members of the Whittier chapter of the society.—Editor.)

The John Birch Society has tabulated literally hundreds of documented books, tape recordings and reports which it makes available to members and nonmembers alike which will make informed people out of concerned people.

Communists are not alarmed about concerned people; however, they recognize that informed people are dangerous because they can intelligently inform others.

It is the greatest fear of the Communist Party in the United States that despite their tremendous influence in our Government and over all our means of mass communication, the American people will wake up too soon to what has really been happening right under their very noses.

Communism operates for the most part in this country by utilizing front organization and underground activities.

COMMON ORIGIN

Communist-front organizations are characterized by their common origin, the rigid conformity of these organizations to the Communist pattern, their interlocking personnel and their methods generally used to deceive the American public. Being part of a conspiratorial movement their essence is deceptive.

The tactics of these fronts is to push as far as possible constitutional privileges by enlisting through this deception the cooperation of as great a segment of the public as can be deceived.

When activities of the Communists reach the realm of unconstitutional endeavor then the underground members take over. These activities go so far as to place concealed members in government, education, and industry.

PROPER TRAINING

Only organizations with members who have been properly trained can cope with the pressures brought to bear between these front organizations and those concealed underground. By watching the front groups and their unconcealed programs it is simple logic to connect those places in government, education, and industry where the party line expounded by the front groups receives the greatest reception.

It should be pointed out here that in all localities where the Birch Society is active it is well established in short order by its members and other freedom groups utilizing the above reasoning and J. Edgar Hoover's 12 rules for identifying fronts, where the Communist danger points that need to bear watching are.

However, none of these people or organizations are ever labeled Communist by the society or its members. Instead, a system of defense is set up to reduce to zero the effectiveness of the Communist activity. This is accomplished without fanfare or publicity, thus leaving the subversive group frustrated but aware of who was responsible. Reports of facts as to subversive activities observed are reported to national headquarters where once assembled can point to future trends in the fight.

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 29, 1961]

SOVIET PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUE STUDIED

(This is the third article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society written by Raye King, V. C. Ramler and Joseph Sullivan, all leaders of the Whittier chapter; Augustfine Cervantes, South Whittier chapter leader; and Joseph Coffman, La Habra chapter leader.)

Everyone who reads the newspapers or magazines, watches television or listens to the radio is aware of the recent great volume of adverse publicity spewing forth against the John Birch Society and its founder Robert Welch.

This is a special type of treatment reserved by the Communist conspiracy for special people or groups that have been really effective and which they cannot directly infiltrate or subvert.

An informative pamphlet printed in the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., on instructions from the 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda" should be read by every man and woman in the United States.

This report is an official document of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the report was relative to the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws.

PRESS INVADED

Quoting from page 6 (a) of the Judiciary Committee report as follows:

"There are in the world few organs of the press, even when bourgeois, in which the Soviet apparatus has no intelligence. The main task of auxiliaries in the press is to manipulate the editor, or if that is not feasible, the reporters, without the editor's knowledge. General notions like 'This paper is conservative' or 'Catholic' are not at all sufficient any longer to recognize the policy it follows toward Moscow. Sometimes the managers themselves are unaware that their newspaper is 'permeated.'"

PROPAGANDA PURPOSE

Quoting further (from p. 14) of the Senate Judiciary Committee report under the heading "Breaking Anti-Communists: Slander, Intimidation, Kidnaping, Murder.":

"An important task of Soviet propaganda is not only to circumvent the gullible, but also to reduce those who clearly realize the danger and zealously proclaim it to a state of powerlessness. Against these people are launched campaigns limitless in intensity as in ignominy. The Communists attempt to make lepers of them, to develop veritable reflexes in public opinion so that a halo of hatred will be instinctively associated with their name.

"Communist and crypto-Communist apparatus put all their ammunition to use in this task and shrink from neither slander nor provocation, forgery, nor blackmail. Here auxiliaries play a leading role: that of scandalmongers.

"Sometimes the Soviet apparatus will denounce an anti-Communist as an underground Communist. Sometimes they will lead the police to believe that he is a terrorist or a trafficker. Slander against the anti-Communist writer Victor Serge reached such a point that even well-disposed police services no longer knew what to think."

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

ACCUSE OTHERS

"The apparatus of Moscow said that Leon Blum was a police auxiliary and purveyor of convicts, charges De Gaulle with having worked for German intelligence, and Soustelle with being a Nazi spy; Syngman Rhee with having sold his country to Japan (charges to be found in the Soviet Encyclopedia or signed by leaders like Maurize Thorez.)

"One of the worst infamies has just been flung at Guy Mollet: he has been accused of nothing less than having denounced people interned with him to the Gestapo. Essentially, these and similar attacks are fabrications from beginning to end; devoid of any foundation and made in the full knowledge that they constitute unmitigated lies.

"In the easygoing atmosphere of the democracies, the endless repetition of abusive attacks has a devastating effect. Indeed, it is not too much to say that there are few people who, having become the target for Communist attacks, did not eventually either lose heart or become suspect themselves to world public opinion," the Senate Judiciary Committee report says.

Economic Hashish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economic Hashish," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC HASHISH

Sometimes the statistical theorizings of economists get so involved they're funny. But when the economic policies of the U.S. Government come to be based on woozy theories, the thing ceases to be a joke.

We have in mind the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which has propounded an elaborate theory of an "output gap" between the economy potential and its actual performance. The theory, described on this page recently by Mr. Otten, is a masterpiece of algebraic triple talk. It is designed to prove a gap, reckoned at $40 billion at the end of last year, and so it does—assuming all its assumptions and mathematics.

Having "demonstrated" the gap, the Council logically concludes that the country faces not only temporary economic problems like the recession now evaporating, but a persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. We have, it seems, a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, we learn, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

If this were all just idle chatter, no one would particularly mind. But this great and growing output gap naturally becomes part of the justification for the Federal Government to fill it—with the tremendous new domestic spending the administration has already embarked on and with the even more massive public-works spending it has in mind. And since the slack is persistent and chronic, the Government has an excuse for trying to take it up indefinitely.

Fortunately the United States still has respected economists who can recognize economic hashish when they smell it. One such is Columbia Prof. Arthur Burns, himself a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mildly but nonetheless devastatingly Dr. Burns has taken apart the gap his successors have so painfully constructed out of thin air.

Among other things, Dr. Burns shows that the Council is not relying on sound, far-reaching historical evidence in projecting its output gap. It rests its case importantly on the fact that unemployment at the business cycle peak in 1960 was slightly higher than at the business cycle peak in 1957. The Columbia economist suggests that this "gives fragile support" to the theory that "the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend."

Moreover, Professor Burns quietly notes that it matters a good deal at what period you start drawing a curve of potential output. The Council chose mid-1955, for no more valid reason than it could have chosen the second quarter of 1957 or the second quarter of 1947—all periods of high employment. If the Council economists had chosen 1957, their own reckonings would show a gap of only $20 billion instead of $40 billion.

And, Dr. Burns goes on, "if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by more than $2 billion."

We hope the Council has the grace to say "touche" to that.

But perhaps the most significant part of the Burns analysis is not in exposing the Council's statistical juggling to prove the point it wanted to prove. There is also the attitude behind such "output gap" theorizing. It is reminiscent of the dominant economic thinking of the thirties, which was that the U.S. economy had become stagnant or mature and therefore required increasingly heavy Federal spending to keep it going.

That theory was proved resoundingly false by events, but here it is again in different form, once again an alibi for massive Federal intervention. The urge to control the private economy never dies.

Not many of us are trained in the intricacies of economic theory, but it takes only commonsense to see through the Council's unamusing fun and games. We hope the President and Congress are not bemused by the latter-day stagnation theorists. Otherwise some of these people may at last succeed in bringing about Government-managed economic stagnation.

Castro Shows True Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been naturally concentrated on the reoccurring problems with the Soviet stooge, Castro, in Cuba. On many occasions I have directed the attention of the Members to the grassroots thinking of the American public as expressed in our local newspapers throughout the country. One of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my district, the Park Forest Reporter, on Wednesday, May 3, presented an editorial entitled, "Castro Shows True Color." It is truly "Main Street, America" thinking and worthy of our serious study.

CASTRO SHOWS TRUE COLOR

Our hemisphere neighbor, Cuba, officially turned Red this week. Fidel Castro took advantage of the May Day celebration to announce that his nation has gone Socialist.

Whatever the name, it's merely a synonym for communism. Cuba is now another link in the orbit of Soviet satellites. Some of the weak and misinformed still say, "so what"?

The announced status of this Nation only 90 miles from our shores can have tremendous repercussions in this Western Hemisphere.

Other Latin American countries are vulnerable to the same type of revolutions which brought Castro to power. In the eyes of their poor and ignorant, which comprise the masses of these backward nations, Fidel has become a Spanish speaking hero. His denunciations of the United States are not beamed for our ears, mainly for theirs.

His boasts give this uneasy populace courage. The taunts that he has held the mighty Yanquis at bay, are echoed through the hills of the Andes and across the broad expanse of Central and South American lands.

Beyond any doubt, his presence is a serious handicap to the future peace of our hemisphere. By outlawing elections, which although meaningless are even held in Russia, he is carving an ignoble niche for himself among the political tyrants of all time.

Fidel's actions bear even greater scrutiny now. Our administration's attention to this problem and its aftereffects is certainly warranted at this time.

Expert Offers Moon in 2½ Years—The Development of a Superrocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the U.S. defense program received a big shot in the arm early this year when the first Minuteman missile achieved complete operational success on its first firing at Cape Canaveral. This marked the first time in history that a missile had performed perfectly on its maiden flight.

Another historical first might be achieved for the United States if the administration takes action on the recommendations of Dr. Harold Ritchey, vice president of the Thiokol Chemical Corp. which produces the first stage of the Minuteman. Dr. Ritchey recently appeared before the House Science and Astronautics Committee and testified that if Congress would provide the necessary funds, the United States could have a man on the moon within 2½ years. This feat would be accomplished by clustering a number of solid-fuel rockets produced by the Thiokol Co., and which, according to Dr. Ritchey, are capable of developing up to 21 million pounds of thrust sufficient to power manned flights to the moon, or to other planets and return.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Mr. President, I have urged the administration to approve plans for development of this superrocket proposed by the Thiokol Chemical Corp. This concept apparently offers our best chance to overtake the Russians in the field of manned space flights, and can be accomplished at far less cost than several alternative plans. I sincerely hope that the administration will not delay in making a decision on this important matter because the United States has the know-how and capability to surpass the Russians in the development and use of outer space if we do not let this opportunity slip from our grasp.

Mr. Cliff Thompson, reporter on defense matters, had an excellent story in the April 16, 1961, issue of the Ogden Standard Examiner, which presents a concise review of the Thiokol proposal and an analysis of other space projects presently under development by NASA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Mr. Thompson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRASTIC OVERHAUL NEEDED—EXPERT OFFERS MOON IN 2½ YEARS

(By Cliff Thompson)

There is a serious doubt in the mind of at least one of the Nation's rocket experts that the United States can overtake the Russians in space with its present program.

He is Dr. Harold W. Ritchey, Thiokol Chemical Corp. vice president, who has proposed a development program he says will give the United States rocket power to duplicate the Russian man-in-orbit feat within 9 months and put an American on the moon in 2½ years.

His program calls for a drastic overhaul and redirection of the present U.S. program for space travel and exploration. And it, naturally, is based on the use of solid fuel Thiokol used so successfully in the Minuteman program.

The spectacular success of the Minuteman missile earlier this year gives added weight to the Thiokol proposals. Thiokol engineering and production staffs produced the large first stage of the Minuteman, the largest solid propellant booster flight tested to date.

CHALKED UP "FIRST"

It was the first missile to perform perfectly on its maiden flight and also marked the first time all stages of a multistage rocket were used in an initial flight test.

Dr. Ritchey outlined details of his proposals to this reporter during an interview in the Thiokol Rocket Operations Center here from which he directs the firm's vast research program.

He began with a briefing on the current U.S. space program which he said "is not designed to do what we have to do to catch the Russians."

"We have developed the technology to leapfrog the Russians in space but we are not using it," Dr. Ritchey said. "If we started right now using all our scientific potential, the United States-Russian race to the moon would be extremely close." If the United States continues its present program, he expects the Russians to beat us to the moon by 4 or 5 years.

The U.S. space timetable has an American scheduled to arrive on the moon in 1970. Dr. Ritchey expects the Russians to have a man there before 1965.

FIRST TO MOON

And he believes the first nation to the moon probably never would be overtaken in the race deeper and deeper into the outer regions of the universe.

Dr. Ritchey says the big U.S. effort must be made in the first, or booster, stage if we are to catch the Soviets.

The first, or booster, stage along with two or three additional stages would put a vehicle into orbit or into escape velocity. In the manned space vehicle, the stages above the booster would be used to maneuver the vehicle in space and return it to earth.

In previous space shots, all stages have been used to put a payload into orbit, primarily because of the lack of a booster that can develop sufficient thrust to lift the necessary loads.

Most space authorities agree the United States is ahead of Russia in most space fields except the large boosters necessary to lift large boosters necessary to lift large payloads into orbit or escape velocity. "Possibly we also lag in our knowledge of how to keep men alive for extended periods in space," Dr. Ritchey said.

LARGE BOOSTERS

The Russian superiority in large boosters can be traced to the different approach the two nations took in overcoming the first big problem encountered in their initial space programs.

When the United States and Russia began space-missile programs at the end of the World War II, the payloads developed were too large for the rockets they were then capable of producing.

The United States refined its payloads to a size compatable with its rocket power. The Russians concentrated on building rockets powerful enough for the big payloads.

To offset the Russian lead in rocket power, the United States needs a dramatic breakthrough in its big booster program—both in size of the booster and the time it takes to get it ready for use.

Thiokol has four proposals to provide these big boosters.

The first and simplest is the one Dr. Ritchey says would give the United States the rocket power to surpass last week's Russian space flight.

CLUSTER OF SEVEN

By clustering seven slightly modified versions of the Minuteman, Dr. Ritchey says, the United States would have a booster capable of putting 25,000 pounds into orbit. This is about twice the size of the Russian payload.

Dr. Richey said Thiokol can develop this propulsion system in 9 months. He estimates its cost at about $1½ million per copy in production quantities.

Thiokol also proposes using the Minuteman principle to produce larger rockets that could be clustered in sevens to develop 21 million pounds of thrust. This system could put 300,000 pounds into orbit or 120,000 pounds into the velocity needed to send a man to the Moon.

Dr. Ritchey reports this booster can be ready for test firing in 18 months and for actual manned space flight within 30 months. The intervening 12 months, he said, would be used in working on the booster and in development of the rest of the vehicle. It is possible the 12-month period could be reduced.

PROPULSION PROBLEMS

The other Thiokol proposals are for different sized rocket boosters using the Minuteman principle.

"Of course I am talking only about the propulsion problems," Dr. Ritchey said. "There are others."

Primarily these involve the development of the vehicle and guidance controls that would take a man into space and back including the protection needed to keep a man alive in space for extended periods of time.

The producer of the propulsion system and the space vehicle would have to work together closely.

The United States is currently pinning its hopes for space travel on three programs:

The first American is expected to go into space sometime this year powered by a Redstone rocket. This plan calls for sending an astronaut some 100 miles or so into the air and back—not put him into orbit.

LIQUID FUEL

The Saturn, a cluster of eight liquid fuel rockets, is expected to be ready in about 3 years. In power and objective this booster compares to the rocket Thiokol says it can develop in 9 months.

The F-1 rocket, a single engine that would develop 1½ million pounds of thrust, expected to take 6 years to develop and test. The F-1 timetable has been delayed, however, because of severe technological problems.

The Nova project in which Dr. Werner Von Braun proposes to cluster four F-1 rockets to produce 6 million pounds of thrust. This project has not been funded and is considered too expensive to begin until after 1965.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration officials are basing their hopes for space travel primarily on the Saturn program.

ASSEMBLY IN SPACE

Dr. Von Braun proposes using six Saturn launchings to send equipment and fuel into orbit from which a space vehicle would be assembled for further travel.

Rocket authorities say this plan has two significant drawbacks—time and cost.

It would cost about $120 million just to build the six first stage booster rockets necessary to send an unassembled spaceship into orbit with the Saturn. Cost of the Thiokol proposal to develop one super rocket capable of sending a vehicle into escape velocity from earth is estimated at $12 million.

And rocket experts say the problems of assembling a ship while its pieces are floating around in space would be tremendous.

The John Birch Society—2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today three articles of a series of five relative to the John Birch Society which have appeared in the Daily News, a widely circulated newspaper in the area of Whittier, Calif. My district includes this area. The articles are commendable for their objectivity. Under unanimous consent I include the remaining articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Whittier (Calif.) Daily News, May 2, 1961]

SOME RELUCTANT TO BE ANTI-COMMUNIST

(This is the fourth article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society written by Joseph Sullivan, V. C. Ramler, and Rave King, Whittier chapter leaders; Joseph Coffman and Augustine Cervantes, La Habra and South Whittier chapter leaders respectively.—EDITOR.)

Some democratic Americans have been trying to convince themselves "that there is something reprehensible in being a sys-

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Mr. President, I have urged the administration to approve plans for development of this superrocket proposed by the Thiokol Chemical Corp. This concept apparently offers our best chance to overtake the Russians in the field of manned space flights, and can be accomplished at far less cost than several alternative plans. I sincerely hope that the administration will not delay in making a decision on this important matter because the United States has the know-how and capability to surpass the Russians in the development and use of outer space if we do not let this opportunity slip from our grasp.

Mr. Cliff Thompson, reporter on defense matters, had an excellent story in the April 16, 1961, issue of the Ogden Standard Examiner, which presents a concise review of the Thiokol proposal and an analysis of other space projects presently under development by NASA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Mr. Thompson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRASTIC OVERHAUL NEEDED—EXPERT OFFERS MOON IN 2½ YEARS

(By Cliff Thompson)

There is a serious doubt in the mind of at least one of the Nation's rocket experts that the United States can overtake the Russians in space with its present program.

He is Dr. Harold W. Ritchey, Thiokol Chemical Corp. vice president, who has proposed a development program he says will give the United States rocket power to duplicate the Russian man-in-orbit feat within 9 months and put an American on the moon in 2½ years.

His program calls for a drastic overhaul and redirection of the present U.S. program for space travel and exploration. And it, naturally, is based on the use of solid fuel Thiokol used so successfully in the Minuteman program.

The spectacular success of the Minuteman missile earlier this year gives added weight to the Thiokol proposals. Thiokol engineering and production staffs produced the large first stage of the Minuteman, the largest solid propellant booster flight tested to date.

CHALKED UP "FIRST"

It was the first missile to perform perfectly on its maiden flight and also marked the first time all stages of a multistage rocket were used in an initial flight test.

Dr. Ritchey outlined details of his proposals to this reporter during an interview in the Thiokol Rocket Operations Center here from which he directs the firm's vast research program.

He began with a briefing on the current U.S. space program which he said "is not designed to do what we have to do to catch the Russians."

"We have developed the technology to leapfrog the Russians in space but we are not using it," Dr. Ritchey said. "If we started right now using all our scientific potential, the United States-Russian race to the moon would be extremely close." If the United States continues its present program, he expects the Russians to beat us to the moon by 4 or 5 years.

The U.S. space timetable has an American scheduled to arrive on the moon in 1970. Dr. Ritchey expects the Russians to have a man there before 1965.

FIRST TO MOON

And he believes the first nation to the moon probably never would be overtaken in the race deeper and deeper into the outer regions of the universe.

Dr. Ritchey says the big U.S. effort must be made in the first, or booster, stage if we are to catch the Soviets.

The first, or booster, stage along with two or three additional stages would put a vehicle into orbit or into escape velocity. In the manned space vehicle, the stages above the booster would be used to maneuver the vehicle in space and return it to earth.

In previous space shots, all stages have been used to put a payload into orbit, primarily because of the lack of a booster that can develop sufficient thrust to lift the necessary loads.

Most space authorities agree the United States is ahead of Russia in most space fields except the large boosters necessary to lift large boosters necessary to lift large payloads into orbit or escape velocity. "Possibly we also lag in our knowledge of how to keep men alive for extended periods in space," Dr. Ritchey said.

LARGE BOOSTERS

The Russian superiority in large boosters can be traced to the different approach the two nations took in overcoming the first big problem encountered in their initial space programs.

When the United States and Russia began space-missile programs at the end of the World War II, the payloads developed were too large for the rockets they were then capable of producing.

The United States refined its payloads to a size compatable with its rocket power. The Russians concentrated on building rockets powerful enough for the big payloads.

To offset the Russian lead in rocket power, the United States needs a dramatic breakthrough in its big booster program—both in size of the booster and the time it takes to get it ready for use.

Thiokol has four proposals to provide these big boosters.

The first and simplest is the one Dr. Ritchey says would give the United States the rocket power to surpass last week's Russian space flight.

CLUSTER OF SEVEN

By clustering seven slightly modified versions of the Minuteman, Dr. Ritchey says, the United States would have a booster capable of putting 25,000 pounds into orbit. This is about twice the size of the Russian payload.

Dr. Richey said Thiokol can develop this propulsion system in 9 months. He estimates its cost at about $1½ million per copy in production quantities.

Thiokol also proposes using the Minuteman principle to produce larger rockets that could be clustered in sevens to develop 21 million pounds of thrust. This system could put 300,000 pounds into orbit or 120,000 pounds into the velocity needed to send a man to the Moon.

Dr. Ritchey reports this booster can be ready for test firing in 18 months and for actual manned space flight within 30 months. The intervening 12 months, he said, would be used in working on the booster and in development of the rest of the vehicle. It is possible the 12-month period could be reduced.

PROPULSION PROBLEMS

The other Thiokol proposals are for different sized rocket boosters using the Minuteman principle.

"Of course I am talking only about the propulsion problems," Dr. Ritchey said. "There are others."

Primarily these involve the development of the vehicle and guidance controls that would take a man into space and back including the protection needed to keep a man alive in space for extended periods of time.

The producer of the propulsion system and the space vehicle would have to work together closely.

The United States is currently pinning its hopes for space travel on three programs:

The first American is expected to go into space sometime this year powered by a Redstone rocket. This plan calls for sending an astronaut some 100 miles or so into the air and back—not put him into orbit.

LIQUID FUEL

The Saturn, a cluster of eight liquid fuel rockets, is expected to be ready in about 3 years. In power and objective this booster compares to the rocket Thiokol says it can develop in 9 months.

The F-1 rocket, a single engine that would develop 1½ million pounds of thrust, expected to take 6 years to develop and test. The F-1 timetable has been delayed, however, because of severe technological problems.

The Nova project in which Dr. Werner Von Braun proposes to cluster four F-1 rockets to produce 6 million pounds of thrust. This project has not been funded and is considered too expensive to begin until after 1965.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration officials are basing their hopes for space travel primarily on the Saturn program.

ASSEMBLY IN SPACE

Dr. Von Braun proposes using six Saturn launchings to send equipment and fuel into orbit from which a space vehicle would be assembled for further travel.

Rocket authorities say this plan has two significant drawbacks—time and cost.

It would cost about $120 million just to build the six first stage booster rockets necessary to send an unassembled spaceship into orbit with the Saturn. Cost of the Thiokol proposal to develop one super rocket capable of sending a vehicle into escape velocity from earth is estimated at $12 million.

And rocket experts say the problems of assembling a ship while its pieces are floating around in space would be tremendous.

The John Birch Society—2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today three articles of a series of five relative to the John Birch Society which have appeared in the Daily News, a widely circulated newspaper in the area of Whittier, Calif. My district includes this area. The articles are commendable for their objectivity. Under unanimous consent I include the remaining articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Whittier (Calif.) Daily News, May 2, 1961]

SOME RELUCTANT TO BE ANTI-COMMUNIST

(This is the fourth article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society written by Joseph Sullivan, V. C. Ramler, and Rave King, Whittier chapter leaders; Joseph Coffman and Augustine Cervantes, La Habra and South Whittier chapter leaders respectively.—EDITOR.)

Some democratic Americans have been trying to convince themselves "that there is something reprehensible in being a sys-

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

ACCUSE OTHERS

"The apparatus of Moscow said that Leon Blum was a police auxiliary and purveyor of convicts, charges De Gaulle with having worked for German intelligence, and Soustelle with being a Nazi spy; Syngman Rhee with having sold his country to Japan (charges to be found in the Soviet Encyclopedia or signed by leaders like Maurize Thorez.)

"One of the worst infamies has just been flung at Guy Mollet: he has been accused of nothing less than having denounced people interned with him to the Gestapo. Essentially, these and similar attacks are fabrications from beginning to end; devoid of any foundation and made in the full knowledge that they constitute unmitigated lies.

"In the easygoing atmosphere of the democracies, the endless repetition of abusive attacks has a devastating effect. Indeed, it is not too much to say that there are few people who, having become the target for Communist attacks, did not eventually either lose heart or become suspect themselves to world public opinion," the Senate Judiciary Committee report says.

Economic Hashish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economic Hashish," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC HASHISH

Sometimes the statistical theorizings of economists get so involved they're funny. But when the economic policies of the U.S. Government come to be based on woozy theories, the thing ceases to be a joke.

We have in mind the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which has propounded an elaborate theory of an "output gap" between the economy potential and its actual performance. The theory, described on this page recently by Mr. Otten, is a masterpiece of algebraic triple talk. It is designed to prove a gap, reckoned at $40 billion at the end of last year, and so it does—assuming all its assumptions and mathematics.

Having "demonstrated" the gap, the Council logically concludes that the country faces not only temporary economic problems like the recession now evaporating, but a persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. We have, it seems, a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, we learn, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

If this were all just idle chatter, no one would particularly mind. But this great and growing output gap naturally becomes part of the justification for the Federal Government to fill it—with the tremendous new domestic spending the administration has already embarked on and with the even more massive public-works spending it has in mind. And since the slack is persistent and chronic, the Government has an excuse for trying to take it up indefinitely.

Fortunately the United States still has respected economists who can recognize economic hashish when they smell it. One such is Columbia Prof. Arthur Burns, himself a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mildly but nonetheless devastatingly Dr. Burns has taken apart the gap his successors have so painfully constructed out of thin air.

Among other things, Dr. Burns shows that the Council is not relying on sound, far-reaching historical evidence in projecting its output gap. It rests its case importantly on the fact that unemployment at the business cycle peak in 1960 was slightly higher than at the business cycle peak in 1957. The Columbia economist suggests that this "gives fragile support" to the theory that "the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend."

Moreover, Professor Burns quietly notes that it matters a good deal at what period you start drawing a curve of potential output. The Council chose mid-1955, for no more valid reason than it could have chosen the second quarter of 1957 or the second quarter of 1947—all periods of high employment. If the Council economists had chosen 1957, their own reckonings would show a gap of only $20 billion instead of $40 billion.

And, Dr. Burns goes on, "if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by more than $2 billion."

We hope the Council has the grace to say "touche" to that.

But perhaps the most significant part of the Burns analysis is not in exposing the Council's statistical juggling to prove the point it wanted to prove. There is also the attitude behind such "output gap" theorizing. It is reminiscent of the dominant economic thinking of the thirties, which was that the U.S. economy had become stagnant or mature and therefore required increasingly heavy Federal spending to keep it going.

That theory was proved resoundingly false by events, but here it is again in different form, once again an alibi for massive Federal intervention. The urge to control the private economy never dies.

Not many of us are trained in the intricacies of economic theory, but it takes only commonsense to see through the Council's unamusing fun and games. We hope the President and Congress are not bemused by the latter-day stagnation theorists. Otherwise some of these people may at last succeed in bringing about Government-managed economic stagnation.

Castro Shows True Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been naturally concentrated on the reoccurring problems with the Soviet stooge, Castro, in Cuba. On many occasions I have directed the attention of the Members to the grassroots thinking of the American public as expressed in our local newspapers throughout the country. One of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my district, the Park Forest Reporter, on Wednesday, May 3, presented an editorial entitled, "Castro Shows True Color." It is truly "Main Street, America" thinking and worthy of our serious study.

CASTRO SHOWS TRUE COLOR

Our hemisphere neighbor, Cuba, officially turned Red this week. Fidel Castro took advantage of the May Day celebration to announce that his nation has gone Socialist.

Whatever the name, it's merely a synonym for communism. Cuba is now another link in the orbit of Soviet satellites. Some of the weak and misinformed still say, "so what"?

The announced status of this Nation only 90 miles from our shores can have tremendous repercussions in this Western Hemisphere.

Other Latin American countries are vulnerable to the same type of revolutions which brought Castro to power. In the eyes of their poor and ignorant, which comprise the masses of these backward nations, Fidel has become a Spanish speaking hero. His denunciations of the United States are not beamed for our ears, mainly for theirs.

His boasts give this uneasy populace courage. The taunts that he has held the mighty Yanquis at bay, are echoed through the hills of the Andes and across the broad expanse of Central and South American lands.

Beyond any doubt, his presence is a serious handicap to the future peace of our hemisphere. By outlawing elections, which although meaningless are even held in Russia, he is carving an ignoble niche for himself among the political tyrants of all time.

Fidel's actions bear even greater scrutiny now. Our administration's attention to this problem and its aftereffects is certainly warranted at this time.

Expert Offers Moon in 2½ Years—The Development of a Superrocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the U.S. defense program received a big shot in the arm early this year when the first Minuteman missile achieved complete operational success on its first firing at Cape Canaveral. This marked the first time in history that a missile had performed perfectly on its maiden flight.

Another historical first might be achieved for the United States if the administration takes action on the recommendations of Dr. Harold Ritchey, vice president of the Thiokol Chemical Corp. which produces the first stage of the Minuteman. Dr. Ritchey recently appeared before the House Science and Astronautics Committee and testified that if Congress would provide the necessary funds, the United States could have a man on the moon within 2½ years. This feat would be accomplished by clustering a number of solid-fuel rockets produced by the Thiokol Co., and which, according to Dr. Ritchey, are capable of developing up to 21 million pounds of thrust sufficient to power manned flights to the moon, or to other planets and return.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

tematic anti-Communist, according to a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Quoting from the report, made relative to the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws, the following is learned:

"The struggle against convinced anti-Communists proceeds from simple premises. The effectiveness of this struggle is due to the fact that it goes on relentlessly and in practically every key. The struggle is marked by the use of a vocabulary including such terms of abuse as "rightist," "Fascist," "negative elements," "dim wit," "police informer," "systematic anti-Communists." This last expletive is the highest form of abuse. And yet quite a few democratic Americans have been trying to convince themselves that there is something reprehensible in being a systematic anti-Communist, forgetting that they take pride in being systematically anti-Fascists.

What's more, they see nothing incongruous in the Communists being systematically antidemocratic. And it is difficult to see how a systematic evil can be fought in any other way than by systematic opposition. This simple truth has not been lost on the Communists. Indeed, one of the main tasks of Communist propaganda is to maintain an atmosphere of constant denigration and criticism of consistent anticommunism.

UNHEARD OF SITUATION

"The success achieved by the Communists in this particular field has been such that a truly unheard-of situation has come about in the Western world, in which anticommunism is often regarded as a greater evil than communism. When one of the parties in a relentless and merciless struggle discovers that it is considered bad form to fight back with the same weapons, it goes without saying that their opponents have scored a major victory in the battle of propaganda which aims at nothing less than the intellectual intimidation of those opponents.

Such intimidation, moreover, thrives on its own effects. So far as serious and enlightened circles keep silent, they leave stigmaticizing communism to reactionary extremists alone; the contention anticommunism equals reaction thus seem confirmed; and serious and enlightened circles keep more silent than ever. McCarthy cast such discredit on exposing cryptocommunism that it is now no longer possible to accuse some body of it without being called a witch hunter. Yet it is quite sure that cryptocommunism did not disappear by magic with McCarthy.

THEY MURDER THEM

When intimidation does not succeed in crushing the counterpropaganda of some particularly prominent anti-Communist, the Soviets do not shrink from crime to silence their voices. They murder them (Trotsky, Krivitsky, Nin, etc.) or kidnap them (Trushnovitch).

This is the first time the Communists have been brazen enough to publicly take on more than 50,000 dedicated, informed and deadly serious constitutional Americans. They can't slander, intimidate, kidnap or murder us all. This they must do to succeed.

By now in this article most readers can pretty well recognize that the John Birch Society is neither Fascist, Nazi or anti anything except anti-Communist. The organization while not of democratic form (for security reasons) is dedicated to the maintenance of a constitutional republican form of government in the United States forever. The society doesn't want to overthrow anybody except Communists and at the same time the society doesn't like to be labeled as conspirators because it is anti-Communist.

We are perfectly willing to be investigated by any American committee and we ask all good citizens to withhold judgment until the verdict is in. We still believe in the jury system, which is more than can be said for Russia or the satellite countries.

[From the Whittier (Calif.) Daily News, May 2, 1961]

HERE'S A TYPICAL MEETING OF CHAPTER

(Last article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society)

A typical meeting of a chapter in the John Birch Society is run by the chapter leader, usually on Roberts' Rules of Order. The meeting is always opened by the pledge of allegiance and a simple nonsectarian prayer. A verbal report is then taken from each member if he has one to offer. There is no pressure put on any member to perform any of the society's activities.

The monthly bulletin is then discussed. This bulletin is distributed from the national home office in Belmont, Mass., and is prepared by the group's founder, Robert Welch. The bulletin contains suggested activities such as new books, reports, or pamphlets to be read, letters to write and activities to perform such as checking on public libraries to determine whether or not pro-American and anti-Communist books are available to the public.

It is usual to have open discussion on topics of the day and to compare notes on experiences. Sometimes a motion picture, still slide pictures or tapes will be shown or played depicting or lecturing on Communist activities to which we should be alerted.

A FOOL OR A COMMUNIST

Only a fool or a Communist will deny that some people in every community are actively engaged in forming peace movements, urging disarmament, protesting loyalty oaths and the existence of Government investigating agencies. They are also in the churches shouting brotherly love and love for God, yet protest to the schools, the nativity scene on Christmas, saying grace at meals, and prohibit showing "Operation Abolition" in the church.

Now the John Birch Society doesn't call them Communists but society members do make it a point to see to it that these people don't have a free hand in running our community. Where good American principles require, we effectively oppose these activities. It should be recognized that where liberal groups organize for pressure tactics that conservatives have only one alternative and that is to react and if necessary to resist. These things work two ways.

FOR THE DUBIOUS

For those who may still be dubious and state that they are unconvinced that an organization like the John Birch Society is necessary, it should be pointed out that there are a number of good reports and books available which will convince even the most skeptical of individuals.

These are all well documented. They are:

1. "The Blue Book of the John Birch Society."
2. "The Naked Communist," Cleon Skousen.
3. "Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover.
4. "The Enemy at His Back," Elizabeth Churchill Brown.
5. "You Can Trust the Communists," Dr. Fred Schwartz.
6. "Retreat From Victory," Senator Joseph McCarthy.
7. "Nine Men Against America," Rosalie M. Gordon.
8. "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," House Document 226, 85th Congress, 1st session.
9. "Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party, Structure—Objectives—Leadership," House Report No. 259, 86th Congress, 1st session.
10. "Communist Illusion and Democratic Reality," J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington 25, D.C.
11. "Crusade Against Governmental Investigating Agencies," Institute for Special Research, Post Office Box 2022 D, Pasadena, Calif.
12. "The Left Swing in Education," Institute for Special Research, Post Office Box 2022 D, Pasadena, Calif.

Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool all the people some of the time and you can fool some of the people all the time but you can't fool all the people all the time." The Communists are spending in excess of $2 billion a year to prove Abraham Lincoln wrong. It was a mighty shock to them to find that you can't fool a member of the John Birch Society any of the time. They are too well informed, a fact for which the American people should give thanks.

A Revised Democracy for United States—Need for Quick Action in Cold War Called Basis for Central Control Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 of this year the Washington Evening Star published an ominous editorial article by Mr. Constantine Brown.

Since the date of that publication I have observed with increasing apprehension a course of events which support the thesis which is stated. This course of events is summarized in substance in the extension of remarks of Congressman BRUCE ALGER, which appeared on page A3441 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 16, 1961. All Americans who love freedom should pause to consider this matter, and consider it well.

I now submit the editorial to which I have referred.

A REVISED DEMOCRACY FOR UNITED STATES—NEED FOR QUICK ACTION IN COLD WAR CALLED BASIS FOR CENTRAL CONTROL TREND

(By Constantine Brown)

Democracies tailored after the old pattern no longer can stand the impact of social, economic and political changes wrought by two devastating world wars and an even more damaging cold war created by international communism. In the new world in which we are going to live henceforth, so contend some of the top "New Frontiersmen" of the present administration, a corrected form of democracy is needed: It must take the shape of a highly centralized government which can deal quickly with all problems, domestic and international, without waiting for the ponderous parliamentary machinery to debate and decide what is to be done.

In other words, the basic political thinking of the leaders of the new administration is to strive to convert our present form of government into what has been known for some time on other continents as managed democracy. The basic civil rights of the individual are left intact. The responsibility for their well-being, however, is placed in the hands of a highly centralized government with one man holding the power of decision:

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

a modern version of the famous slogan of the French King Louis XIV, "I am the state."

The intellectual explanation for this effort to change surreptitiously or overtly from the old-fashioned and time-tried American system of government is being explained in the following manner. The basic parliamentary form of government cannot protect the peoples of this country in the face of the ruthless and powerful form of dictatorship which has been established in the Soviet Union and Communist China. The consequences of the cold war have demonstrated this axiomatically. Hence, to cope with the new order in the world, a number of western leaders are concentrating all powers into their own hands as the most effective means of meeting the Red global drive.

The spectacular success of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has changed the face of France in less than 3 years and transformed that nearly bankrupt nation into one of the most powerful in the Western World, seems to have inspired to a certain extent the thinking of the high priests of our New Frontier theory.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between the modern French chanticleer and President Kennedy. The 70-year-old general-statesman is the actual voice of France. He has been elected to guide the destinies of La Patrie by an overwhelming vote of confidence of more than two-thirds of his fellow citizens. The individualistic French have indorsed his ideas of managed democracy with the result that the traditionally powerful French parliamentary system is reduced to a rubber stamp.

Mr. Kennedy was elected with a flimsy majority of a little over 100,000 votes out of 67 million ballots cast last November. His thinking fully harmonizes with the 10 or 12 advisers in the White House who have been dubbed "the apostles." He is Chief Executive in the full meaning of the words in as far as the people of this country are concerned, and provides a much-needed dynamism which has been so lacking in the Eisenhower administration. His philosophy is not his own, however. His political evolution is the result of the inspiration he has derived from the thinking of the theoreticians and the professors who have been advising him in the past and are now surrounding him in the White House. The thinking of "the apostles" is contained in books, magazine articles, speeches and lectures written over the last 10 years. They all have the same common denominator: welfare state at home and preparing the path for "one world."

Automation, the dramatic stride in science, and "population explosion," it is argued by the advocates of the welfare state, make our past way of life and free enterprise obsolescent. To give the masses enjoyment in the new way of life the Government must step in by regulating, planning, and assisting the peoples. In international endeavors the United States, which has assumed voluntarily the leadership of the free world, must abandon gradually its past policies of resisting with force or "containing" international communism. It must leave no stone unturned to bring about a relaxation of tension with the Red tyranny and spare no effort to achieve coexistence lest "60 million Americans" lose their lives in a nuclear conflict.

This is a firm and one may say immutable conviction on the part of "the apostles" and is being shared fully by the dynamic Chief Executive himself. Henceforth we must expect all initiative, all decisions and all policies to stem from the White House alone.

Import Competition and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have had made a major study of the effects of imports and exports on employment of American workers. I have submitted it to the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment of the House Education and Labor Committee.

I am ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman JOHN H. DENT, considered this study so important that he has made copies of the study available to each member of the subcommittee which he heads.

It is being used as the basic tract of the subcommittee at this point in its own work.

The study was made by Dr. Howard Piquet, senior specialist in international economics of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Piquet is well-known, and is highly thought of by Members of the Congress.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from this study:

IMPORT COMPETITION AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By Dr. Howard S. Piquet)

There is no question about the potential advantages of free trade from the point of view of "pure economics." If trade were free everywhere and if each country were to specialize in producing the goods in which it has the greatest comparative advantage, relative to other countries, productivity everywhere would be greater and economic resources would be utilized more effectively than they now are.

If all the goods that can be produced in a country are listed in order of descending comparative advantage the products heading the list in each instance would be those that are exported. These are the products that can be produced most efficiently relative to other countries. In the United States, where land and other natural resources are relatively abundant but where labor, normally, is relatively scarce, the list would be headed by such mass-produced goods as office machinery, many kinds of industrial equipment, certain types of electrical machinery, road-building and other construction equipment, automobiles, and agricultural machinery.

At the lower end of the list would be a relatively small number of products requiring considerable labor to produce, such as: china tableware, hand-blown glassware, certain electronic products, and hardwood plywood. Somewhere between the two extremes would be goods in the production of which comparative advantage is less clear, such as certain wood and paper products.

The advantage of the United States lies largely in the production of goods that can be produced in quantity by automatic, or near-automatic, machinery. Such goods are produced under the principle of decreasing unit cost and require large fixed overhead. These are the industries in which large size is an advantage.

The lines of production in which the United States is at a comparative disadvantage are those usually characterized as small business, many of which involve a high proportion of labor cost. These are the industries that are most hard pressed by import competition.

Around the turn of the 20th century Mr. H. O. Havemeyer, the sugar magnate, said: "The tariff is the mother of the trusts." Whether or not the tariff then facilitated monopoly, it certainly is not an important factor in this respect today. At the present time most large businesses, such as petroleum and steel, are liberal trade minded. Their operations are worldwide and they oppose interference by government. The tariff has become more significant as an instrument for protecting small business.

There can be little doubt that, if the United States were to adopt a thorough-going policy of free trade, a number of small businesses would be hard hit. Certain marginal firms, and in some cases entire industries, would not be able to withstand the resulting low-cost foreign competition. This is one of the troublesome facts that must be faced regardless of one's theoretical convictions regarding the desirability of freer international trade conducted along multilateral lines. Removal of tariff protection and the consequent stimulation of imports would have the effect of accelerating the concentration of industrial power in the United States.

INDUSTRIES THAT HAVE APPLIED FOR RELIEF UNDER THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

Congress has provided machinery for affording relief to industries that have been seriously injured by, or that are threatened by serious injury from, increased import competition resulting from concessions made in trade agreements with other countries. It seems reasonable to assume that industries that have not appealed to the Tariff Commission for relief under this provision of law, or that have failed to supply the Tariff Commission with data adequate to enable them to reach a decision as to the existence of injury, are not suffering serious injury from import competition.

Even a cursory examination of the list of industries that have applied for relief under the escape clause (sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended) discloses that few, if any, of them could be regarded as big business. Typical of the products concerning which it is complained that imports have been seriously injurious are: women's fur-felt hats and hat bodies, garlic, tobacco pipes and bowls, screen-printed silk scarves, scissors and shears, groundfish fillets, and bicycles. Nowhere in the list does one find such typically large-scale industries as bulk chemicals, automobiles, heavy iron and steel-mill products, office machinery, or agricultural implements.

Since the escape clause was enacted, 69 industries, or segments of industries, have applied for relief from injurious import competition. Of these, the Tariff Commission found "serious injury" or "threat of serious injury" to exist in 25. In 36 industries it found no serious injury, or threat of serious injury, and in the remaining 8 it either terminated the investigation because the complaining companies failed to provide adequate factual data or dismissed the investigation at the request of the applicants.

Keeping in mind that each of the really large industries in the United States employs a veritable army of workers (the Ford Motor

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

I would be devoid did I not once again acknowledge and express my appreciation for the advice and cooperation afforded me by Vice President Boggs, International Representative, Buoy, and Walter Mason, legislative representative of the AFL–CIO.

MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

(Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the following comments were sent me in a memorandum from one of my very fine constituents, Comdr. N. H. Black, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, of Arcadia, Calif. I believe his comments regarding Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker are of sufficient interest to have them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so others may be made aware of these opinions. I think they are well stated and represent a very important analysis of this particular situation. Under permission granted, I include Commander Black's comments at this point in my remarks:

IMPORTANT COMMENTS ON THE CASE OF MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

It is highly improbable that the following facts will be brought out in the case of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker:

1. A masterly job of negative conditioning is being done on Americans by the Soviet through every medium of mass communications.

2. It is a military operation, devised by military scientists and carried out by Soviet agents.

3. A prime target is every member of the American Armed Forces, at home and abroad.

4. The Soviet method (which we learned in Korea) simply stated is this, "Separate an American from his everyday faith—in his God, his country, and his outfit, and his friends—and you've got him."

5. Red techniques in Korea were educational group psychotherapy—in reverse. It separates, tears down instead of builds up, faith and courage. (The export version aimed 24 hours a day at all Americans they now call cybernetic warfare.)

6. Our men in Korea whose everyday faiths were strong inside them, didn't break, didn't get fooled, and lived. Those who were educated or separated from their everyday beliefs gave up. Many died for no physical reason.

7. President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Thomas Gates ordered corrective training in moral and spiritual leadership as a military countermeasure to this new technique in warfare—"cybernetic" attack on the will to resist.

8. Optimum purpose in the Navy's leadership program, for example, is for each man to reexamine, restudy, and reaffirm the moral and spiritual values of his own life and those of his faith, his country, and his service in the Navy. In discussions of national values, he is familiarized with the rise of communism and the Soviet threat to the American way of life.

9. General Walker, like any military commander, is responsible for the combat readiness of the men in his command. The measures and background materials he uses to safeguard his men against the Soviet cybernetic softening process are matters of command responsibility and judgment.

10. It is both coincidental and unfortunate that some of the best background material on Communist subversion and Soviet cybernetic operations is from civilian sources. Most is researched and condensed from thousands of reports and documents on file in Washington. The same facts and figures have been used continuously in hundreds of publications and films issued by scores of anticommunism organizations, as well as by the training materials departments of the armed services.

At first glance, General Walker's recall is like permitting the Squodunk Gazette to dictate dismissal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff over the editor's disagreement with training policy. The problem here is far more serious than stupidity. This is an example of how extremely sensitive our services have had to be to political pressures.

Political pressure from the left has more power than we realize, to hamstring and paralyze. This is true of business and industry, especially Government regulated industry such as mass communications. It is doubly true of Government, at any level, and the armed services.

The technique of continuous pressure applied to pressure sensitive areas in the American complex has been termed "Soviet Principle No. 10." It is "the application of paralysis as a principle of Soviet global warfare." What it is and how it works is found in hearings before the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, February 19–28, March 3–4, 1958. The immediate answer might well be a complete briefing of the President on the kind of sophisticated psychological and subversive war being waged against us. We have many experts eminently qualified to do this. The same people should be appointed as a task group to devise counter measures for all Americans. Training aids and materials now used by the Armed Forces and many patriotic groups is readily available.

The enemy is far more sensitive and vulnerable to this type of warfare than we are. To the criminal mind exposure is tantamount to failure and death. That is why hell hath no fury like a Soviet dupe under the white spotlight of truth.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

(Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to find a newspaper reporter who will look into the facts before writing about the John Birch Society. George Todt is such a reporter. Mr. Todt has discussed the society in six articles which have appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Express, a leading newspaper in Los Angeles, Calif., two of which follow:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Feb. 10, 1961]

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

Do more than 100 American patriotic societies possess the right to press for the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States by Congress in these modern times?

Many members of the press consider this such a ticklish question that they would prefer to see it swept under the rug.

Frankly, I think the question deserves to be aired. Why not put the cards on the table for everybody to see? Who is afraid of the truth? Let the chips fall where they may.

What are the facts in this case?

They are, quite simply, that the John Birch Society—a rapidly mushrooming anti-Communist organization in the United States—has requested a large number of American patriotic societies to join with it in whipping up popular support in Congress to impeach Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

There seems to be a lot of grassroots sympathy for this action and the movement is apparently growing by leaps and bounds.

QUESTIONS WISDOM

I do not believe that there has been any false inference that Mr. Warren is a Communist, which he most certainly is not. The John Birch Society merely claims that he has performed his official duties poorly and in such manner as to bring considerably less than terror to the hearts of the Reds. It questions the wisdom of certain key decisions.

According to Robert Welch, founder of the society, one of these was *Brown* v. *Brown* because it overturned numerous previous decisions by the same court on nothing more substantial than "a set of psychological and sociological theories advanced by a Swedish Socialist named Gunnar Myrdal and a group of American Communist fronters with whom Myrdal had been associated."

Here are three more decisions which have particularly incensed Welch and his supporters, as seen through his eyes:

"In the Steve Nelson case the Warren court wiped out the antisedition laws of more than 40 States, and denied those States the right to protect themselves against treason, on the ground that the Federal Government had pre-empted the sedition field by passing the Smith Act (which act this same Supreme Court has done everything it could to vitiate).

"OF HIS ACTS

"In the Konigsberg case the Warren court canceled the right of any State to deny a license to practice law to a man merely because he would not say whether he was a Communist or not.

"In the Sweezy case the Warren court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of New Hampshire was without authority to question a lecturer at the State university—supported by the taxpayers of New Hampshire—concerning reported subversive activities.

"There have been dozens more which we cannot even mention here."

Welch bases his argument for impeachment on Article III, Section I of the Constitution, which provides that Federal judges "shall hold their offices during good behavior."

HERE ARE SOME

Since the Constitution specifies no other arrangement for limiting the tenure of Federal judges to the periods of their "good behavior," Welch believes it is to be considered obvious that impeachment is to be used for those who violate this requirement.

Now it appears that there is a considerable body of American citizens who express themselves as dissatisfied with the behavior of Mr. Warren as Chief Justice of the United States.

They want Congress to bring impeachment proceedings against him.

I am not arguing the merits of this case, pro or con.

But the question has been raised as to whether these people are within their legal rights to take this kind of action.

Actually, it seems to this writer that no officeholder in this democratic Republic of ours ought to be beyond the reach of the people should they become dissatisfied with his public action.

UNDENIABLE FACTS

I say this impartially with reference to any position and regardless of the political party, race, creed or color of the person holding it.

Those in public life who arouse the wrath of the people must expect to settle their account with the people thereafter.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Impeachment by Congress under special circumstances is a legitimate kind of accounting in the Republic of the United States.

I am not a member of the John Birch Society, although I know fellow citizens who are enrolled in the organization.

From all outward appearances I have been impressed with their dedication to anti-communism and constitutional Americanism.

I cannot see where they have overstepped their right here.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Mar. 15, 1961]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

There is no dearth of "Committees for Fair Play" in the United States nowadays whenever Communist-dominated organizations become the justified targets of the wrath of the American people.

They even have one of these things for Castro.

Now that an anti-Communist organization is under fire—the John Birch Society—let's see if the forces of liberalissimo observe the same high standards of conduct toward their opponents that they constantly whine for themselves. Where is the spirit of Voltaire here?

BEWARE, BEWARE

I am not a member of the John Birch Society, but I think that, in their case, a great number of innocent, patriotic Americans have been already much-maligned by ideological hatchetmen who should have stood in bed as the saying goes.

As a member of the press who is interested primarily in fairplay—and above all, the truth—I think it is time to set the record straight. What's the score?

Let me make this suggestion to my readers in advance: Don't permit cunning voices with axes to grind stampede you by the unholy smear technique before you have a chance to investigate this matter without bias or prejudice to your own satisfaction.

Go and find out for yourselves.

Let your own eyes and ears—and conscience—be the judge.

OF INTERPRETATION

There is a John Birch office in Los Angeles, located at 3750 W. Sixth St., zone 5. Telephone: DUnkirk 5-2389. Its manager is a young man named Kent Steffgen. He told me he would be glad to answer your questions. Ask him about the side of the story he represents before arriving at any hard and fast decision.

When I first perceived the gigantic smear shaping up against the members of the John Birch Society—which numbers some of our finest citizens in its ranks here in the southern California area and elsewhere—I interviewed Steffgen about the matter.

Knowing the lofty American ideals of the society from some of my friends who are members, I considered it nothing less than lunatic to attempt to link this dedicated organization to the likes of Karl Marx, Adolf Hitler and Gerald L. K. Smith.

If I ever wrote a lie of that dimension, I would forever hang my head in shame.

The patron saints of the John Birch Society are George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Teddy Roosevelt.

GUILTY ONLY

To go to the heart of the problem, it is true that the founder of the John Birch Society once wrote a pamphlet for circulation among about 100 friends in which he was extremely critical of men like former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, former Vice President Richard Nixon, former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and his brother, the present Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles.

These are all men whom I, personally, warmly admire and whose patriotic Americanism I have extolled on innumerable occasions in this column. I deplore any intemperate language used against any of these four fine men. And I won't buy a comma of it.

But having said this, there are other factors to be considered. In the first place, Robert Welch, the John Birch founder, wrote these intemperate statements before he had founded the society. It was in a book called "The Politician"—never in the society's "Blue Book." So what the author wrote before the society came into existence is certainly not binding—and has never been intended to be—upon the later membership.

BY ASSOCIATION

To condemn the membership for something Welch stated before the society came into existence is little short of what our liberalissimo friends would call guilt by association. Now we can't have that, can we?

In the second place, let's look at the forest instead of the trees in this case. Granted that Robert Welch used intemperate language against four men whom I greatly admire—am I still to write off his magnificent fight against communism because of this personality factor?

I think the most important thing about the John Birch Society lies not in the personality of its founder—who likely needs a good public relations director like crazy—but in the fact that it is dedicated to the overthrow of communism and the protection of constitutional Government in the Republic of the United States.

We can afford to overlook some faults of these dedicated anti-Communists on that account.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is of vital importance that this body, truly the most representative of the American people, be constantly mindful of the plight of every nation dominated and held captive by Soviet Russia.

With this thought in mind, the following message is intended for the American people as well as the people of Rumania.

It is with a mixture of great sorrow and little joy that I greet the people of Rumania today, May the 10th, the 84th anniversary of Rumanian Independence Day. My great sorrow is that I cannot greet a free Rumania whose people commemorate this day openly in jubilant nationwide celebrations. My joy is that I can greet the people of Rumania, still desirous of liberty and freedom, through the Rumanian National Committee which is working zealously for that freedom all over the world today.

In 1877, your nation united and proclaimed its independence, joining the community of nations as a sovereign kingdom. You valiantly preserved your precious independence from outside domination through the many years of turbulence and war in the Slavic states. With the advent of World War II, forces of violent determination imposed their brutal will on you only by sheer military might. After driving these forces of nazism from your borders and being assured of territorial integrity by the Soviet Union, the people of Rumania were subjected to the insidious techniques of Russian imperialism. Slowly seizing power from within, the Soviet Union finally forced the abdication of King Michael on December 30, 1947. From that day on, Rumania has been a captive nation. We of the free world have not let time change our deep conviction that you are held against your will by a totalitarian form of government in no way representative of the feelings of your people. There is not adequate evidence that your people want communism. On the other hand, we know of the suffering and the trials under the present Communist regime. If you were allowed to vote under totally free elections, and the results of those elections showed that you preferred a Communistic form of government, then we would be convinced. Until that time, we will continue to have faith in your determination to one day live again under a government of your choice and within a society of your choice.

It is with these ideas in mind that we in the United States join in commemoration of your independence day, hoping that each of you will celebrate this day in your hearts and minds in anticipation of the day that you can freely celebrate it with your shouts and thanksgiving.

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE

(Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, Dayton and the Great Miami Valley are both the birthplace and the cradle of aviation—a fact of which all our folks are justifiably proud.

In the short period of time since the first powered aircraft was conceived and built in Dayton, Ohio, by Orville and Wilbur Wright, the most phenomenal progress in the history of the world has been made in the areas of speed and distance in transportation. The first powered flight was made by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk, N.C., on December 17, 1903. From that very short flight just 58 years ago manned aircraft has continued to go forward until recently when a U.S. experimental aircraft attained a speed of greater than 3,100 miles per hour. This U.S. aircraft not only responded perfectly to the will, skill, and desire of the pilot but it also landed safely. Thus transportation by aircraft, commercial as well as military, from the most widely separated places in the world can be accomplished in a relatively few hours.

In recognition of these facts our U.S. Armed Forces used military aircraft with tremendous success in World War I and to progressively greater advantage during World War II and the Korean war.

Back in the early days of aviation the center of the research, development, and

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

problem. It exists here in New York, for example, in housing and employment practices.

Of course, the National Government is very much concerned with this problem, and is taking what are hoped to be effective steps to discharge its own obligations in this area. I believe that the beginning that has been made is extremely promising. President Kennedy's forceful leadership in this field has been reinvigorating. Under it, this administration has been able to create what I believe is a new and better climate for opportunity to flourish.

And here in New York, under your Governor and your distinguished mayor, much has been done. In this enlightened State and city, statutory protections exist to insure fair employment practices, for example.

Thus far government; but what of our private groups?

In reply to the question—what can I do for my country?—I say to the members of the business and management and labor communities of America: stop discriminating.

No individual or group needs a law or an Executive order to coax or command them to observe a simple rule of morality.

That would be a genuine contribution to the national welfare. Businessmen can follow fair employment and promotional practices and policies on their own volition, in their own businesses. Labor unions can end discriminatory habits using their own means and powers.

I might add a corollary thought here, as a visitor to this greatest of all western metropolises. As hosts to the world, and especially to the United Nations, the citizens of New York can make a real contribution to our welfare by pursuing the open and unprejudiced policy of the civilized host—as I am sure you try to do.

This should be true not only for first rank Ambassadors and diplomats but for the entire world community that lives and works here within your city limits.

My hometown, the Nation's Capital, faces the same responsibility.

What can you do for your country?

Let me give another example. I am, of course, very much concerned with labor-management relations. We have lately been engaged in an effort to insure regularity and stability in the work going on at our missile bases. This, in fact, is one of the things that brings me to New York today.

It has been suggested that the quickest way to attain the goal we seek is to adopt a law, to compel a solution.

But I have learned from long experience that the adoption of laws does not necessarily solve the problem. Whether a law could or could not is beside the point. Labor and management, without a law to compel them, can on their own volition agree on these principles:

That the program is one of urgent priority;

That the work should be performed economically, at decent wage levels, under fair conditions;

That, as during the war, free labor and free management can outproduce the regimented and compelled work force of the totalitarian countries;

That, therefore, no interruption of work should take place.

Now this attitude, and this remark, are not necessarily limited to the organizations working at missile bases.

My experience has convinced me that if labor and management are awaiting a bill of particulars on what they can do for their country, they don't have to look far.

There is no Government policy that prevents labor and management from developing, by mutual effort, better machinery for the settlement of disputes in vital matters—and in other matters as well. I would and do encourage such an effort. When labor and management ask: What can we do for our country?—an obvious answer is: Keep the peace. Keep the industrial peace not because a law compels you to but because of the welfare of the country and because it is to your own enlightened self-interest to do so.

I mentioned civil rights and labor-management relations as examples where voluntary effort in the public interest is self-suggesting.

Let me give you a third, based upon an interest inherent in the Secretary of Labor's job. Last week, the President issued an Executive order creating a Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. I have the honor to serve with Attorney General Kennedy and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff on that committee.

The President's Committee will, of course, enlist the aid and seek the cooperation of governments and private organizations in this fight against the waste of delinquency.

In this important area, with $10 million authorized for Federal grants, it is obvious that if the President's Committee is to succeed it must depend upon the cooperation and aid of States and private organizations.

In commenting on this Executive order, the Washington Post remarked: "Juvenile delinquency is essentially a local problem which must be dealt with through local agencies—schools, churches, settlement houses, community welfare agencies—operating together to bring hostile and rebellious youth into participation in the community's life. The real need is to put what is now known into use and to prod responsible private and public agencies at the local level into more effective operation."

I agree with that sentiment. The Federal Government can perform good and needed service in this field. It is also true that long before the Executive order was issued, manifesting Presidential concern and intention to appropriate action, the question of what you could do for your country provided its own answer to men and women already at work on delinquency.

I have given you three instances of areas where individual and group response to the President's concept should be clear. There are many others, both inside and outside my own responsibility.

In the singular world of today, a world of troubled neighborhoods rather than separate nations, our Government undertakes aid programs that are of vital and paramount importance for the peace and security of the world.

These programs do not exclude voluntary efforts by groups and individuals.

A religious group near Washington, D.C., for example, has been sending cows to areas in the world where a cow is a treasure, and where fresh milk is a luxury.

Large programs like CARE are effective expressions of private American concern. They are examples of what persons in private capacities can do for their country and the world—for in leading the world toward greater well-being they also strengthen the United States.

This is a great metropolitan area, a huge complex of people and activity.

You know that as social problems arise, as the daily business of living becomes more and more demanding and challenging, the powers that can be brought to bear upon solutions need to be more effective. Responsible government must be an instrument for progress when the means at hand to private groups are not adequate to the problem they face. At the same time, government cannot be responsible unless our people make it so, unless they view their own actions in the light of the interest of all.

I would paraphrase the words of the President this way: All of us know what our country has done for us, and all of us know, in our heart and conscience, what we should do for our country. The resolution to act, to move forward, to seek the path of good conscience, is the only decision that remains.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, an article by George Todt which appeared in the April 28, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Express, a newspaper published in Los Angeles, Calif., helps to clarify the objectives of the John Birch Society. Mr. Todt's observations stem from an interview he recently had with Mr. Welch. Under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—WHY WELCH IS ATTACKED

"Neither cast yet your pearls before swine."—Matthew XIII: 6.

Not long ago I had a private interview with stormy petrel Robert Welch of the much-publicized John Birch Society and asked him what he was up to in these modern times.

"Do you intend to form a third party?" I asked him.

"Not at all," he replied. "The real purpose of the John Birch Society is to act as a positive force for moral rearmament in our Republic. We wish to rejuvenate the Nation with the spirit of the Founding Fathers and the American Revolution of 1776. It has been sadly lacking in recent years. What could be more important now?"

Welch appears to be anything except the Fascist ogre he has been represented to be in the so-called liberal comunications media from here to New York City and points in between.

HIS SECRET?

When one talks to this sincere and dedicated person at close range, it is hard to imagine valid reasons for the hysterical hatchet work from so many sides.

Why does this mild-mannered little man panic the "liberals" more than all of Nikita Khrushchev's armored divisions, submarines and his Communist fifth column now operating with near-impunity and untold impudence in our country today?

What is his secret, anyway? Perhaps, I have a hunch that might explain it. It's only a guess—but here goes.

I think Bob Welch may have pricked the moral conscience of all too many Americans who have had their head much too far down in the sand ere now. Many of us have been fiddling carelessly while the Republic is burning in more ways than one. Our slogan has been "business as usual."

Frankly, we have been so preoccupied with our materialism that we have pretended the danger which now threatens us with potential destruction unless defeated just did not exist in the past.

Or if we did not go quite that far, we at least minimized the danger of the Communist conspiracy to our national welfare. It was something we kept putting off for "manana"—the tomorrow which never comes.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4

to Freeman. He would have found additional reasons to oppose the Freeman-Cochrane-Kennedy plan for controlled farming.

An acute meat shortage has hit Moscow, according to the news report of April 28. The Government in Russia, operating in accordance with the Communist theory of national planning, sets the amount of meat which Soviet citizens need to consume and which Red farmers are to produce. An AP correspondent who toured the state-run butcher shops in Moscow failed to find a single scrap of fresh meat, not even sausages. Canned meat from Bulgaria and dried fish were available.

Meat could be bought in the central market where the peasants bring produce grown on their private plots of land. But the peasants set their own prices in that market, and chunks of beef including the bone were being sold for 4.75 rubles per kilogram, or more than $2 per pound. The peasants were selling eggs for 16 cents each.

Pravda, the official news outlet for the Communist government, made some vague allusion to the fact that public control had not forced the fulfillment of meat quotas. Other Soviet newspapers offered no explanation. Apparently it isn't good form to point out that Red agriculture has failed under the direction of Nikita S. Khrushchev.

If an American farmer, or any American Congressman, wants to know how a controlled agriculture operates, all he has to do is look to Russia. Government control of supply, which is exactly what Freeman wants and what the Communists have in Russia, will bring meatless days to Washington.

The United States doesn't need to adopt any plan of this kind.

We Can Defeat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an essay on the subject of "Communism," written as an English assignment by one of my young constituents, Willard M. Hanzlik. It is always encouraging to find our youth of today so cognizant of the necessity to heed the teachings of our forefathers and the laws of the Constitution with which we have been endowed, in order to preserve our country and our way of life. I feel this essay has set forth quite well, the basic ideals of all loyal American citizens:

WE CAN DEFEAT COMMUNISM

Communism can be defeated by our having more confidence in our own Government, and by each person trying harder to make the system work. American citizens who develop a love for their country will not be influenced by outside political forces. Good American citizens will be alert to the evils of the atheist communism. The Government of the United States was founded in 1776 by earnest God-loving men. These men had a surging power behind them—this was faith. If faith had not been so strong as it was, America would not be America as we know it today. Men like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson had great faith in America. We cannot afford to let these Founding Fathers down; America must be kept strong. By supporting America's democratic ways, we, as citizens, can help to make America stronger. Communism is completely contrary to all of our basic standards; therefore by allowing communism to enter America, we are actually denouncing our democracy. Is America to allow foreign aggression, or are we to stand up and fight for what we believe? Certainly an atheist society cannot spread to a God-loving society of freedom. Above all else, remember this: Jesus said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." J. Edgar Hoover says at the conclusion of his book, "Masters of Deceit," "In communism we see what happens when freedom is extinguished. This must give us renewed zeal to work untiringly to uphold the ideals of justice and liberty which have made this Nation great."

Address by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the testimonial luncheon given in his honor by the mayor and city of New York on Monday, May 15, 1961, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg presented a most interesting and thought-provoking address in which he touched on several important problems of national interest. His views and thoughts deserve wider attention, and I am therefore pleased to insert his address into the RECORD.

Secretary Goldberg deserves to be commended for demonstrating that his approach to problems is not one-sided. He gave sound advice to both labor and industry, and I hope and trust they will take his advice in a spirit of cooperation for the Nation's interest. He asked both of them to observe "a simple rule of mortality" by eliminating discrimination in housing and employment. Laws alone will not end such discrimination, but it can be accomplished through fair practices and unprejudiced policies.

Significantly, Secretary Goldberg spoke about the work stoppage at our missile bases in which we are all so deeply concerned. In speaking of the remedies to this situation, he said:

It has been suggested that the quickest way to attain the goal we seek is to adopt a law, to compel a solution.

But I have learned from long experience that the adoption of laws does not necessarily solve the problem. Whether a law could or could not is beside the point. Labor and management, without a law to compel them, can on their own volition agree on these principles;

That the program is one of urgent priority;

That the work should be performed economically, at decent wage levels, under fair conditions;

That, as during the war, free labor and free management can outproduce the regimented and compelled work force of the totalitarian countries;

That, therefore, no interruption of work should take place.

I consider these proposals by the Secretary of Labor as very sage advice and I sincerely hope that both sides will agree to it. As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I was extremely perturbed when I learned about these work stoppages and how much it is hurting our progress in scientific research and development, especially in space research.

The text of Secretary Goldberg's address is as follows:

I am greatly honored by this affair tendered to me by the mayor and the city of New York. It is, I think, characteristic of this city that you have so honored two members of President Kennedy's Cabinet, and that those members are the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor.

I am sure my distinguished colleague, Luther Hodges, was as gratified at the luncheon given for him as I am today.

These affairs show an awareness—by your great mayor and the citizens of New York—of the interrelationship of industry and commerce and labor in the life of this city, and indeed in the life of the country.

Gestures of this sort are indications of the truly progressive character of your city. It is that progressive tradition, dating back many years, that has helped New York attain the eminence it enjoys in this Nation and throughout the world.

I would like this afternoon to address myself to a provocative concept advanced by our President, one that has been the subject of much discussion and soul searching, both in our press and in our own individual minds.

In his inaugural address, the President said: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country."

The question has been raised as to why the country was not furnished with a bill of particulars. This desire of people to be told specifically how to make their contribution to the national effort is quite understandable. Yet, I would like to raise the counterquestion with you as to whether this uncertainty does not in itself reflect a lack of awareness on the part of the people of their responsibilities to our society.

We pride ourselves for our dependence upon free enterprise, a free economy and personal decision to provide us with the goods and services for a good life. We are justifiably proud of our free institutions and the contributions they make. The managers of our vast industries, the leaders of our great labor unions, the important citizens who direct community affairs—all are among the prime movers of our national life.

At the same time, while Government has important responsibilities which it must exercise responsibility in our society, we ought not let Government dominate our lives. I am sure that most of us agree with that concept.

Given that general frame of mind, then, I would like to pose this question: Why is there any lack of awareness of what these tremendous groups, and the individuals in these groups, can do to advance the national interest?

I would like to suggest some answers, by way of specific examples in fields closely related to my own responsibilities as Secretary of Labor. I am, for example, the Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The problem of discrimination exists in our national life.

That problem is not geographic in character. It is not, as those of us who live in the large, northern industrial cities would sometimes like to believe, strictly a southern

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000200110008-4